

## Jesus, Savior, the Glory of Your People Israel

In Luke 2, Simeon refers to Jesus as “your salvation” (*to sōtērian sou*) and then, by way of apposition, identifies Jesus as “a light for revelation to the Gentiles” and as “the glory of your people Israel”. This essay hopes to shed some light on the significance of Jesus as “the glory of your people Israel”<sup>(1)</sup>. Certain preliminaries, however, must be taken care of before I enter directly into the topic.

1. Occasionally one will read that “glory” is more properly understood to be the (second) object of the preposition *eis* (v. 32); thus, one should understand the text to say that Jesus is the “light for revelation” and the “light for glory”<sup>(2)</sup>. While this reading cannot be grammatically ruled out, the words of J. Nolland seem wisest, and I follow them,

Glory and light are paralleled in the OT... Also, while ‘glory’ for a ‘light’ is what we might expect..., ‘a light’ for ‘glory’ is less intelligible. The text echoes the thought of Isa 60:1-2 (or possibly the LXX of Isa 46:13; cf. further Sir 49:12), and it is best to follow its lead and treat ‘glory’ as parallel to ‘light’, with both in apposition to ‘salvation’ (v. 30)<sup>(3)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> For a very useful discussion of this topic, cf. A. SIMON MUÑOZ, “Cristo, luz de los Gentiles: puntualizaciones sobre Lc 2,32”, *Estudios Bíblicos* 46 (1988) 27-44.

<sup>(2)</sup> Cf. R. BROWN, *The Birth of the Messiah* (New York 1977) 440: “...it is more likely that ‘glory’ is in apposition to ‘revelation’”; apparently also F. BOVON, *L’Évangile selon Saint Luc 1-9* (Comm du NT; Geneva 1991) 142.

<sup>(3)</sup> J. NOLLAND, *Luke 1-9:20* (WBC 35a; Dallas 1989) 120. Cf. C. F. EVANS, *Saint Luke* (London 1990) 217: “‘light’ and ‘glory’ could be in apposition to ‘salvation’ or be governed by ‘prepared’; and ‘glory’ could be parallel to ‘light’, or governed by it and parallel to ‘revelation’”. Note also F. CRADDOCK, *Luke* (Louisville 1990) 33: “...making glory stand with light in apposition to salvation”. I should add that while I agree with Nolland’s statement about the parallelism, I am reluctant to consider Isaiah/Sirach as the basis of it; the rest of this essay will, I hope, explain why I think this way.

2. David Tiede<sup>(4)</sup> suggests that, at least in thought, “glory” is a further refinement of “light”, as though the *kai* (v. 32b) were to be understood as “that is”. Thus, the enlightenment of the Gentiles will be the glory of Israel<sup>(5)</sup>, for it is Israel which, as Isaiah suggests, will draw the Gentiles to the true God and be glorified in the process<sup>(6)</sup>. While it is possible to understand Simeon’s words in this way, and while it is true that Isaiah speaks of the Gentiles finding their way to the true God by coming to splendid Jerusalem<sup>(7)</sup>, the grammar underlying this interpretation must be forced, it seems, to justify it. I prefer to think that *kai* plays its ordinary coordinating role here; certainly, the text is understandable without appeal to *kai doksa* as a modification of “light”.

3. While one might think that the meaning of the phrase “glory of your people Israel” is contained in the very phrase itself, attention to the canticle of Simeon makes it clear that any interpretation of the phrase must keep in mind that “glory” is in apposition to “*to sōtērion*”<sup>(8)</sup>. Thus, somehow the saving act is looked upon as glory for Israel, and, conversely, glory is to be understood as the expression of salvation<sup>(9)</sup>.

(4) Cf. D. TIEDE, “Glory to Thy People Israel: Luke-Acts and the Jews”, *SBL Seminar Papers* 25 (Atlanta 1986) 142-151.

(5) Cf. H. SCHÜRMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, vol. I (HTKNT 3; Freiburg 1969) 126, n. 209: “Sicher wird die Bekehrung der Heidenvölker auch Israels *Doksa* sein... Die Erleuchtung der Heiden wird Israel rechtfertigen und... zur *doksa* reichen”. L. JOHNSON, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville 1991) 55, refers to “...citation from Isaiah’s Servant Songs, this time 46:13, ‘I will put my salvation in Zion, for Israel my glory’”.

(6) “Isaiah 46:13 seems to be the source for the closing phrase. Jesus is the climax of God’s revelations to Israel (cf. 9:4-5). Therefore he is her glory and the means whereby she can achieve her ultimate purpose as God’s people... Psalm 91:15 declares that one who is in trouble will be rescued by the Lord who will honor (or, glorify) him”, CRADDOCK, *Luke*, 33.

(7) “[V. 32b] is not immediately intelligible since ‘glory’ is generally that which belongs to God. It may rest on Isa. 60,1-3, where Jerusalem’s light is synonymous with the Lord’s glory over her, which becomes her own light and brightness. This will be the form of Israel’s destined salvation”, EVANS, *Luke*, 217.

(8) Many commentators note this well; cf. CRADDOCK, *Luke*: “...declaring Jesus to be the means of salvation for all people, Jew and Gentile (39)... Simeon see Jesus as the light and the glory” (33).

(9) “Durch sein Kommen erfährt es [das Volk Gottes] die Verherrli-

4. A right approach to understanding the phrase about “glory” is to keep in mind the contrast of the people of God with the Gentiles<sup>(10)</sup>. Salvation for Gentiles is summed up as a light by which they gain revelation; characteristically Gentiles need light by which to find the true God, to escape from what is considered their “normal” state, darkness (blindness)<sup>(11)</sup>. Simeon’s words suggest, then, that the reader look for what is characteristic of salvation for Israel. At times light is this characteristic but, as Simeon suggests, we do well to consider salvation for Israel as “glory”. Thus, if light belongs to the salvific sphere of the Gentiles, glory belongs to the salvific sphere of Israel. Salvation will be played out, Simeon suggests, in these two spheres. I look, then, for some verification that glory is indeed the apt expression, the one suitable to clarify what salvation is for Israel.

5. While I will look carefully at the uses of “glory” in the Old Testament, to draw meaning for the word therefrom, it is useful as at least an initial guide to cite an authoritative, if modern, definition of “glory”. To do this I note a definition offered by *The Oxford English Dictionary*: “something that brings honour or renown; a subject for boasting; a distinguished ornament; a special distinction; a ‘boast and pride’”<sup>(12)</sup>.

---

chung, zu der es Gott bestimmt hat”, W. WIEFEL, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (THKNT 3; Berlin 1988) 80.

<sup>(10)</sup> “...the nations will realize what glorious privileges God has granted to Israel in the course of the centuries, but especially through the birth of Jesus from their midst”, N. GELDENHUYS, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids 1951) 119.

<sup>(11)</sup> Luke notes in the Benedictus, a hymn regarding Israel and not the Gentiles, that “we sit in darkness and in the shadow of death” (Luke 1,79; cf. Mal 4,2); GELDENHUYS, *Luke*, 119, observes that “The people of Israel and the nations are enveloped in spiritual darkness”. Darkness, however, is not a symbol just for the state of the Gentiles. EVANS, *Luke*, 217, suggests, as do many other commentators, that we look to Isaiah 42,6.16; 60,1-2, “where darkness is said to cover the earth for the Gentiles...”. Cf. S. FARRIS, *The Hymns of Luke’s Infancy Narratives* (Sheffield 1985) 150, who in passing notes: “...the OT background which associated light with the Gentiles and glory with Israel...”.

<sup>(12)</sup> *The Oxford English Dictionary*, vol. 6 (ed. J. MURRAY et al.) (Oxford 1933) “Glory”, 229.

On the other hand, glory can be described as "something that makes one honored or illustrious" (13). This definition suggests two main thrusts for the word "glory": one, that glory belongs to one person about whom others can be said to be proud, and again, that glory belongs to people by virtue of a deed done by someone other than the people. Thus, a family can be said to be proud of the member who is glorious by virtue of some excellence, and a family can be said to be glorious by virtue of some act of just one of the family. When applying this twofold sense of "glory" to the Scriptures, it is clear on the one hand that the division of "glory" into two points is useful, but on the other hand that it is often difficult and perhaps unnecessary to maintain the division. In any event, I will employ this twofold distinction in the hopes of giving full play to the senses in which the Scriptures use the term "glory".

In the light of the above five guidelines, I look first for enlightenment to one of Luke's admittedly major sources, the Jewish Scriptures, noting always the Septuagintal form of these Scriptures (14). Thereafter, I will look to the Lucan work to see how Luke seems to have incorporated "glory of your people Israel" into his Gospel and Acts (15).

### I. The Jewish Scriptures

The appearances of "glory" in the Old Testament are many, very many (not to mention the verb "to glorify" and the pertinent

(13) *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* (ed. L. Urdang) (New York 1968) "Glory", 561.

(14) The Old Testament Greek text used in this essay is that of *Septuaginta* (ed. A. RAHLFS) (Stuttgart 1965).

(15) For general reference works regarding "glory", cf. *TDNT* II, 232-255; *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, vol. I (ed. L. COENEN-E. BEYREUTHER-H. BIETENHARD) (Wuppertal 1967) "Ehre", 204-207; *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. VI (New York 1967) "Glory", 513-514; *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (ed. R. BROWN-J. FITZMYER-R. MURPHY) (New Jersey 1990) "Glory", 1447 (where one finds references in the volume to "glory"); *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (ed. B. ORCHARD et al.) (New York 1953) "Glory", 1235 (wherein are listed references to "glory"); *Harper's Bible Dictionary* (ed. P. ACHTEMEIER) (San Francisco 1985) 349; J. L. MCKENZIE, *Dictionary of the Bible* (Milwaukee 1965) "Glory", 313-315; F. VIGOUROUX, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, vol. III (Paris 1926) "Gloire", 250-251.



semantic field); and often the term is linked quite directly with its Lucan coordinate, “*to sôtêrion*”. Thus, it does not serve us to cite all or most of the passages mentioning glory and to arrive at a synthesis therefrom<sup>(16)</sup>; rather I will present only certain texts which I think are most helpful to identifying Luke’s intention, that Jesus is “the glory of your people Israel”.

### *Glory and Israel*

The Jewish tradition is replete with remembrances and expectations of glory. It becomes apparent in the reading of the Scriptures that glory was conceived as something precious in Israel. A society may be understood through the variety of what it expresses as its value-statements or uses as its value-terms; one gathers, perhaps with some surprise, that glory is a notable value for Israel and a frequent way of describing its happiness. “... Jacob has taken everything that belonged to our father, and from all that was our father’s he [Jacob] has created all this glory (*pasan tēn doksan tautēn*)” (Gen 31,1; consider v. 16: “All wealth and glory, which God took away from our father, will be ours and our children’s”).

When Joseph sums up for his father both his own success in Egypt as well as the assurance that Jacob will suffer no famine, Joseph uses one word, “Announce to my father all my glory (*pasan tēn doksan mou*) here in Egypt, and all that you see...” (Gen 45,13). The holy stole of Aaron must also be known as glorious: “And you shall make the sacred stole for Aaron your brother for an honor and glory” (Exod 28,2; v. 40: “...the tunics and belts and turbans you shall make for honor and glory”). God’s saving of Israel from Egypt merits many kinds of description in the Scriptures; one of these is “God, the one who led them out of Egypt; as glory was his might (i.e., his single-horn)” (Num 23,22; 24,8). To describe the displeasing state of Balaam, Balak has recourse to only one word, “The Lord has deprived you of glory” (Num 24,11). Moses is commanded by God to appoint Joshua as his successor; God tells

<sup>(16)</sup> On “glory” as it appears in the Old Testament cf. W. EICHRODT, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, vol. II-III (Stuttgart 1961) 11-15 (especially in the prophets); D. BALY, *God and History in the Old Testament* (New York 1976) 31-32 and 190-205; W. ZIMMERLI, *Old Testament Theology in Outline*, trans. D. Green (Atlanta 1978) 79-80.

Moses, "and you shall put upon him [some] of your glory" (Num 27,20). To stem the scourge of hemorrhoids and mice afflicting Philistines because of the presence of the Ark of the Covenant in the temple of Dagon, the guilt offering should be images of hemorrhoids and mice; then the Philistines are to "give [them] to the Lord [as] glory" (1 Sam 6,5). Indeed, with the Philistine capture of the Ark, the women surrounding the dying wife of Phinehas summed up the tragedy, "Gone is the glory from Israel" (1 Sam 4,22). Similarly, but on a personal plane, Job can sum up his grief with the words "He has stripped me of my glory; he has removed the crown from my head" (19,9).

In a variety of ways the book of Esther shows how glory is for it a key descriptive term. Mordechai prayed to God, "... and there is no one who will outglory you in your desire to save Israel" (4,17b)..." I did what I did so that I not place the glory of man above the glory of God" (4,17e). Esther then prayed that "You know I hated the glory of the lawless" (4,17u), "that I did not glorify the banquet of the king" (4,17x). Later, "she [Esther] took off her penitential garb and put on her glory" (5,1); (note earlier: "taking off her garments of glory" [Esth 4,17k]). She appeared then before the king: "...his face ablaze in glory" (5,1d) and explains, "My heart was frightened from fear of your glory" (5,2a). Later, "Haman recounted his wealth, and the glory with which the king surrounded him" (5,11). The king asks, "What glory or kindness have we done for Mordecai?" (6,3). Finally, the book closes with the words, "And the power and the beneficence and the wealth and glory of the king has been written in the book... Mordechai was great in the kingdom and was considered glorious by the Jews" (10,2-3). Indeed, even when seeking to describe the power of the horse, LXX Job says, "Do you put on him his panoply, do you take from him the glory of his snortings?" (39,20). Later, Job describes God as one who "adorn yourself with glory and honor" (Job 40,10).

Still other texts provide samplings to show the importance glory plays in Israel's way of thinking: "God gives a throne of glory as inheritance to them (= *penēta* and *ptōchon*)" (1 Sam 2,8). "What you did not ask I have given to you, and riches and glory as there was no man like you among kings" (1 Kgs 3,13; cf. 1 Chron 29,25.28; 2 Chron 1,11.12). In praise of God, David in part sings: "Belonging to you (*para sou*) are riches and glory" (1 Chron 29,12).

Kings, too, are depicted with the word glory: “Jehoshaphat... enjoyed great wealth and glory” (2 Chron 17,5; 18,1); “...King Uzziah... you have broken faith and no longer have part in the glory that comes from the Lord” (2 Chron 26,18); “Hezekiah possessed very great wealth and glory” (2 Chron 32,27.33)”. In speaking of Jerusalem, Tobit offered his joyous prayer, “Happy those who grieve over you... for they will rejoice seeing all your glory” (Tob 13,16 [BA; S: *charan*]).

Finally, the Psalms offer quite an array of texts which show how much Israel valued glory; some of these texts follow. The psalmist prays for help: “If I am at fault... let my enemy trample my life to the ground, lay my glory in the dust” (7,6). To describe the nobility of the human being, the psalmist notes that God has crowned human beings “with glory and honor” (8,6). Through His intervention, God has helped the king, “glory and majesty you conferred on him” (20,6). Glory sums up many situations: “all the glory of the daughter of the king...” (44,14); “fear not when... the glory of his house increases..., his glory will not go down with him” (48,17.18); “grace and glory he bestows” (84,12); “They made a calf in Horeb, and adored a molten image; they exchanged their glory for the image of a grass-eating calf” (105,19-20). Two psalm citations are particularly striking. First, the psalmist expresses himself: “... You clothed me with gladness, so that my glory [= soul] might sing praise to you” (29,13); secondly, the psalmist arouses himself, “My heart is ready, O God... Awake, my glory [= soul]!” (56,9).

The purpose of all the above citations is to provide a sense of how far-reaching was the use of glory for Israelite society, how much the concept of glory had summed up values for Israel, how precious glory was for Israel — so that we might understand better why Luke would naturally define salvation for Israel as glory.

Certainly, any reader would be ready to recall that glory was a key element in expressing what Israel thought was fitting for God. “Thus have I gazed toward you in the sanctuary to see your power and your glory” (Ps 62,3); “announce among the nations His glory” (Ps 95,3). When God appears, He reveals His glory (e.g., Exod 40,34; Lev 9,6.23; Num 12,8; 14,10.21.22; 16,19; 17,7; Deut 5,24). “The heavens cannot contain the glory (*tēn doksan*)” (2 Chron 2,5); “the prayer of these two was heard before (in the presence of) the glory of God [S], the glory of the great Raphael

[BA]" (Tob 3,16; 12,12 [*kyriou S*].15 [*kyriou S*] [*tou hagiou BA*]. "The heavens proclaim the glory of God" (Ps 18,1); "Who is this king of glory? the Lord, strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in war" (Ps 23,8). "The voice of the Lord twists the oaks and strips the forests, and all in his temple say, 'Glory!'" (Ps 28,9). "May His glory fill all the world" (Ps 71,19); "And with glory you will receive me to Yourself" (Ps 72,24). "Give glory today to the Lord, God of Israel" (Josh 7,19; Ps 28,1-2; 56,6.12); "Give God glory" (1 Chron 16,24.27.28.29; 2 Chron 30,8); "Blessed is the name of Your glory" (Neh 9,5; Jud 9,8).

Glory, then, was a favorite term in the liturgical and other vocabulary of Israel; it represented a very high value. I have stayed away from any reference to the major prophets till now because at this point I wish to present what I consider to be an even more significant usage of glory in the Old Testament — and this is seen particularly in the major prophets, together with some reference to authors subsequent to them. It is this sense of "glory" which I think was especially influential in Luke's placing glory in apposition to salvation for Israel.

The enjoyment of glory leads inevitably to the bitterness of glory lost. Israel suffered two terrible exiles, and, especially in relation to the second, glory now represents a more complex concept. It is something lost; it is something, Israel hoped, to be regained; its loss is associated with sin, its re-attainment to be aided by repentance. Indeed, Israel looks to its regaining glory as a way of expressing its conviction that it remains the Chosen People of God.

I had noted earlier that glory at times can refer to the success of "one of the family", of whom the rest will be proud; certainly, one can see in the texts cited thus far in this essay sufficient indication that that aspect of glory is present in Israel's thinking, whether in its looking to God or to its leaders. But there is also the aspect of glory bestowed on (or regained by) the group, especially through the efforts of one. It is this second aspect which most concerns us now, as I emphasize how Israel, who so often recognized glory in individuals and in God, sought to regain its own glory lost through sin. It will be particularly noteworthy that often glory appears very closely connected, not only with sin and repentance, but with Simeon's *to sōtērion*.

As one analyzes the Jewish Scriptures, the perception grows that glory is to be best understood in the tragic historical context of

Israel. Glory is not just a consequence of the early Joshuan conquest, of Davidic/Solomonic amassed power and wealth and wisdom, or even a bestowed quality flowing from the covenants with God. Glory is also bewailed as absent in Israel for long periods. This is true particularly in the Prophets.

### *Ezekiel*

Ezekiel is famous for his account of the departure of the Glory of God from its resting-place at the heart of Israel (10,18-23; cf. "The Lord's glory had filled the temple" [1 Kgs 8,11; 2 Chron 7,1.2.3]). This departure precedes defeat, enslavement, humiliation, loss. But, since the Babylonian triumph was understood to manifest the sinfulness of Israel, the departure or loss of the Glory of God, and thus Israel's glory, is due to the sinfulness of Israel, particularly to Israel's idolatry (e.g., 5,6-15; 8,1-18; 36,17-18.25-32). But Ezekiel will see, as the end of his book of prophecies shows, the return of the Glory of God to its Temple (43,1-5). This return coincides with God's freeing his people, with their repentance and with the restoration, at least initially, of the glory Israel once had (11,16-20; 39,21-29). Glory is now explicitly the term chosen by which to image saved Israel. "I will place my glory within you... and they [the nations] shall know that... no longer will I hide my face from them, for I have poured out my spirit upon the house of Israel, says the Lord God" (39,21.28-29); "Behold the glory of the God of Israel coming from the east... and the land shone with His glory" (43,2).

### *Jeremiah*

Jeremiah, too, speaks in these terms of glory lost and found: "Say to the king and to the queen mother: come down from your throne; from your heads shall fall your crowns of glory" (13,18; cf. 31[48],18, where similar phrases describe the punishment of Moab: "come down from glory..."). Israel had enjoyed the favor of God: "...as close as the loincloth clings to a man's loins, so had I made the whole house of Israel and the whole house of Judah cling to me, says the Lord; to be my people, my glory, my praise, my beauty" (13,11).

"But they did not listen" (13,11). Rather, "does any other nation change its gods? — yet they are not gods at all! But my people have changed their glory for useless things... they have forsaken

me” (2,11.13). Because Israel will not listen humbly, will not “give glory to the Lord, your God, before it grows dark and your feet stumble on the dark mountains and the shadow of death replace the light for which you wait” — because Israel will not listen humbly, the men from the north will descend on Jerusalem, so that God will disconsolately ask her, “Where is your flock I gave to you, the sheep that were your glory?” (Jer 13,15-20).

Lamentations will say, “My glory has been poured out upon the ground” (2,11); people will walk past ruined Jerusalem, to ask “...is this the city which they called the Crown of Glory, the Joy of all the earth?” (2,15).

Baruch had urged Jacob to embrace the law of the Lord, so as not to “give your glory to another, your privileges to an alien race” (4,3). The loss of glory at the Babylonian conquest would eventually be corrected with God’s saving intervention. “As Zion’s neighbors lately saw you taken captive, so shall they soon see your salvation (*hymōn sōtērian*) from God, which will come with great glory and unending splendor” (4,24). Restoration of glory to repentant, just Israel is now the song of Baruch: “Jerusalem, take off your robe of mourning and misery; put on the splendor of glory from God forever; wrapped in the cloak of justice from God, bear on your head the mitre that displays the glory of the eternal name. For God will show all the earth your splendor: you will be named by God forever the peace of justice, the glory of God’s worship” (5,1-4; cf. Isa 52,1). The sign of salvation will be glory: “Here come your sons, whom you once sent away, gathered now... by the word of the Holy One, rejoicing in the glory of God” (4,37); “Put on this glory...” (5,1).

### *Isaiah*

One of the most important prophets to speak on the topic of restored glory to Israel is Isaiah. In an earlier time, when northern Israel had cast its lot with Syria/Aram against Assyria and Judah, Isaiah had prophesied that “the remnant of Aram shall have the same glory as the Israelites... On that day the glory of Jacob shall fade and his full body grow thin” (17,3-4). To what is this loss of glory due? “For you have forgotten God, your savior, and remembered not the Rock, your strength” (17,10). Israel had turned to the worship of other gods; let them save Israel. But even within

this bitter oracle Isaiah can finally speak of God's saving intervention, "But God will rebuke them [Israel's enemies] and they shall flee far away... in the evening they spread terror, but before morning, they are gone! Such is the portion of those who despoil us, the lot of those who plunder us" (17,13-14).

Assyria will destroy the northern kingdom of Israel, then threaten Jerusalem/Zion, but eventually itself be destroyed. Amidst Isaiah's many encouraging images of Jerusalem's escape from Assyria is that of the king: "Your eyes will see a king in his glory" (33,17); this king "with us" might be the Messiah, or the God of the Messiah, "Indeed the Lord will be there with us, majestic; yes, the Lord our judge, the Lord our lawgiver, the Lord our king, he it is who will save us" (33,22)<sup>(17)</sup>.

With Deutero-Isaiah, the rhythm of glory lost/glory restored — the former through sin, the latter by a savior and through repentance — is intensified. Jerusalem, formerly razed by Babylon, is to be comforted now, for her guilt is expiated, she has received double for all her sins (40,1-2). Now, the Lord is returning to Jerusalem; "at that time the glory of the Lord will be revealed, and all mankind shall see the salvation of God" (40,5). Here we note an intensified linking of *doksa* with *to sōtērion*. It is the saving Lord who returns His glory to Jerusalem; through being saved Jerusalem will find its glory, in His glory, restored. God calls, "I am God, ... there is no just god or savior except me. Convert to me and you will be saved, you from the end of the earth... only to the Lord belong justice and glory... by the Lord shall the children of Israel be justified and in God will they be made glorious" (45,22-25); "Convert to me and I will redeem you [Jacob and Israel]... God has redeemed Jacob, and Israel has been made glorious" (44,22-23).

An Isaian text which is very significant for Luke's work is that of 46,13. Again, this time in a prophecy against esteem for foreign (here Babylonian) gods, Israel's Yahweh affirms, "I am God and there is no God except me" (46,9). As proof of this, Yahweh describes his control of history, which ends with the significant

<sup>(17)</sup> Isaiah often foresees Israel's glory as occurring through and resulting from Yahweh's intervention: the historical data which explain the relationship between intervention and glory in Isaiah's visions are well laid out and explained in J.WATTS, *Isaiah 1-33* and *Isaiah 34-66* (WBC 24,25; Waco 1985 and 1987).

terms, "I brought near my justice and I do not delay the salvation that comes from me; I have placed in Sion salvation which is glory for Israel (*tō Israēl eis doksasma*)" (46,13).

With the redemption (v.3) and cleansing (v.1) of the exiles, Isaiah invites Jerusalem, "Put on your glory, Jerusalem, holy city" (52,1).

Still later, Isaiah calls Israel to repentance, to a new sense of fasting, the fasting the Lord desires (58,6-7). As a result of this repentance, "...the glory of the Lord will envelop you" (58,8). As part of His renewal of covenant with Israel, God promises that, as David commanded nations, so restored Israel, once enslaved, shall rule others, "because of the Lord your God, the Holy God of Israel, who has made you glorious" (55,5). It is to this people that God calls, "Be shining, Jerusalem, for your light has come to you, and the glory of the Lord has shone upon you; darkness and clouds cover the earth for the gentiles, but the Lord will shine upon you and His glory will be seen upon you" (60,1-2). It is light from God's glory which makes glorified Jerusalem a light for the gentiles. Glory is at the root of this light, and the gentiles will proclaim that the glory of Jerusalem is due to the salvation of the Lord (*to sōtērion tou Kyriou*) (60,6). Thus, through salvation comes glory which bestows a light to the gentiles.

In this time, "the glory of Lebanon will come to you... to make glorious my holy place; the children of those who humiliated you shall come to you with reverence..." (60,13-14). In these days of peace, the new walls of Jerusalem will do their duty and merit the name "salvation" (*to sōtērion*) (60,18). The days of mourning are at an end. "No longer shall the sun be for you your daylight, nor will the rising of the moon enlighten the night for you; but the Lord will be for you unending light and God will be your glory" (60,19-20). With repentance, "Your entire people will be just... the work of God's hands will become glorious" (*erga cheirōn autou eis doksan*) (60,21). Indeed, the anointed herald (61,1) will announce a year of God's favor which should include joyfully exchanging "ashes for glory", "discouragement for clothing of glory" (61,3); those mourning for Jerusalem will become mighty trees, planted by the Lord "to give Him glory (*eis doksan*)" (61,3).

In hope of the restoration of Jerusalem the prophet waits for her vindication (*dikaio synēn*), her victory: "your salvation (*to sōtērion*) shall burn like a torch" (62,1). Thus, "nations will see



your vindication and kings will see your glory" (62,2). Here, salvation by God results in glory for Jerusalem. Finally, the prophet calls on all who have mourned for Jerusalem; they are encouraged to "drink and be filled from her consoling breast, so that having drunk you will revel at the entrance of her glory" (66,11). Through many prophecies, therefore, the Book of Isaiah<sup>(18)</sup> has consistently and remarkably provided, for future Israel and for Luke, the striking imagery of sin and punishment, repentance, salvation and glory of Jerusalem<sup>(19)</sup>.

### *Daniel*

In Daniel's vision regarding judgment and One Like a Son of Man, the LXX (according to witnesses 88 and Sy) notes that to this One "was given authority, [control of] all the nations, and all glory" (7,14). Since Daniel most likely interprets the One like a Son of Man to be Israel<sup>(20)</sup>, this text is important for the argument that not only will God or a leader of Israel be glorified after Israel's suffering, but that Israel will itself enjoy glory after suffering.

### *Maccabees*

Speaking of another painful experience in Israel's history, that of the abuses from Antiochus IV, the author of 1 Maccabees poetically describes the suffering of Jerusalem: "Her dishonor was as great as her glory had been, and her exaltation was turned into mourning" (1,40). While not immediately and explicitly ascribing guilt to his people which would have made these sufferings the

<sup>(18)</sup> Though in this article I have not cited the minor prophets, the following observation is noteworthy; "...Zechariah had repeatedly (see 1:16-2:13; 8:1-23; 9:9; 12:1-13:1; 14:1-21) affirmed that Jerusalem would one day be finally and permanently redeemed, and his language had made it clear that he was thinking of a restoration far more glorious than what was achieved when Nehemiah rebuilt the city's walls", D. GOODING, *According to Luke* (Grand Rapids 1987) 56.

<sup>(19)</sup> Cf. FARRIS, *Hymns*, 150: "It was thought that in the last days God would give glory to Israel (Is. 46.13; 60.1,9)".

<sup>(20)</sup> Less certain of this identification is J. GOLDINGAY, *Daniel* (WBC 35; Dallas 1989) 167-193; this monograph also provides a very useful discussion and bibliography as to whether or not Daniel 7 is dependent on 1 Enoch, or viceversa, or both dependent on other sources (150-153).

punishment for sin, it is clear by implicit juxtaposition of texts that certain Jews, law-breakers who seduced many people (1,11.15.52), were in part responsible for the sorrows of Jerusalem; fidelity to God's law brings glory. "We see our sanctuary and our beauty and our glory laid waste, and the Gentiles have defiled them; why are we still alive?" (2,12-13). Mattathias encourages his sons to

be zealous for the law and give your lives for the covenant of our fathers; remember the deeds that our fathers did in their times, and you shall win great glory... Do not fear the words of a sinful man, for his glory ends in corruption and worms... Children, be courageous and strong in keeping the law, for by it you shall be glorified (2,50-51).

The sufferings caused by Antiochus are caused, too, according to 2 Maccabees, by the sins of Israel:

Antiochus did not realize that it was because of the city's inhabitants that the Lord was angry for a little while and hence disregarded the holy Place. If they had not become entangled in so many sins... but what the Almighty had forsaken in his anger was restored in all its glory, once the great Sovereign became reconciled (2 Macc 5,17-20).

Glory, then, is the result of repentance and restoration, the result of a saving intervention of the reconciled Lord of Jerusalem.

### *Psalms*

Here, too, one finds the integration in Israelite thought of glory as the result of a divine saving, often after sin has been identified as the reason for glory lost.

Psalm 3 connects protection and glory, "You, Lord, are my shield, My glory and the one lifting up my head" (3.4).

In Psalm 20 LXX, where the psalmist's concentration is on the sole person of the king, the psalmist prays for God's answer to the king's call "in time of distress", that "the name of the God of Jacob defend you" (v. 1). In v. 6 the psalmist says, "Great [will be] his glory as a result of your saving intervention" (*en tō sōtēriq̄ sou*), glory and great splendor you will bestow upon him".

From another perspective, glory is the result of right living and proper sacrifice. After God's promise: "Call me in the day of trouble and I will have mercy on you and you will glorify me" (Ps 49,15), and after God's further complaint that "You cast my words

behind you" (v. 17), God concludes: "Sacrifice of praise will glorify me [God], and here is the path (of right living) in which (*kai ekei hodos hē*) I will show to him [who hears my word] the salvation (*to sōtērion*) of God" (Ps 49,23). Salvation leads to glory of God, right living leads to salvation and to the sacrifice of praise. In this psalm God calls His people to right living, the gateway to proper sacrifice and to glory of God, and to salvation in time of distress; in giving glory, living righteously and offering proper sacrifice, God's people, we can presume, will be made glorious.

The psalmist calls God his support, his stronghold, his savior (*sōtēr*)... his help, his hope (61,6.7). Within these titles of surety, significantly he proclaims that "In God is my salvation and my glory [*epi tō theō to sōtērion mou kai hē doksa mou*]" (v. 8). In a later psalm, the psalmist calls for the disgrace and shame and confusion of his enemies (69,3-4); he calls upon God for rescue and help (v. 1) and hopes for exultation and gladness (v. 5). Then he joins together salvation and glory of God: "May those who love your salvation [*to sōtērion sou*] say 'May God be glorified [*megalynthētō*]' " (v. 5). Since his enemies go in disgrace and shame, one can assume that the psalmist, once saved, will live in glory.

In Psalm 84 LXX, the psalmist sings of the saving God in a variety of ways. God favors his land (v. 1) and has turned away the imprisonment of Jacob (v. 1); He has forgiven Jacob's guilt, his sins (v. 2) and, the psalmist prays, has forgotten His anger, His displeasure, His wrath (vv. 4-6). The psalmist prays for life, joy, kindness, salvation (*to sōtērion sou*), peace (vv. 7-9). Then the psalmist notes that "near is God's salvation (*to sōtērion autou*) to those who fear Him, so much so that glory dwells in our land" (v. 10). God is glory dwelling in our land; He dwells there because, sin forgiven and forgotten, God saves those who fear Him. The "glory in our land" surely restores the glory of Jacob.

That this is the proper line of thought is shown by the words of the psalmist in Psalm 90 LXX. To him who says of God that "He is my refuge and my fortress, in whom I trust", God replies: "he shall call upon Me and I will hear him; I am with him in trouble and I will show mercy to him (*ekseloumai*) and will glorify (*doksasō*) him... I will show him My salvation (*to sōtērion mou*) " (vv. 15-16). Indeed, the psalmist fittingly calls: "Sing to the Lord, bless His name; tell the good news of His salvation (*to sōtērion autou*), proclaim among the nations His glory" (Ps 95,2-3). It is this glory

which, in Israel, makes Israel glorious. As the psalmist says later, "He will raise up the lowly in salvation (*en sōtēriq*); the holy will boast in glory" (149,4b-5a); the execution of the sentence of condemnation "is the glory for all his holy ones" (v. 9).

Finally, there are a series of psalm texts which are most instructive, as they join together the various elements I have been stressing, salvation, glory, sin and repentance: "With God is my salvation and my glory (*sōtērion mou kai doksa mou*)" (61,8). "Near to those who fear Him is His saving act (*to sōtērion autou*), the dwelling of glory in our land (*tou kataskēnōsai doksan en tē gē hēmōn*)" (84,10). "Sing to the Lord, bless his name; announce *to sōtērion autou* day after day. Announce among the nations *tēn doksan autou*, among all the peoples *ta thaumasia autou*" (95,2-3).

### *Sirach*

In the Book of Sirach, Wisdom "sings in praise of herself, in the midst of her people she boasts" (24,1); within her song Wisdom notes that "I took root in a people made glorious (*dedoksasmenō*), in the portion of the Lord, of his heritage". Israel is glorious because it is the Lord's people; it is "right" that God intervene, save, so that Israel regain its favored status. Indeed, understanding and prudence belong to the aged, to those who know God, to those "*dedoksasmenoīs*" (25,5), and if they boast, they boast of their "fear of the Lord (*phobos kyriou*)" (25,6). Thus, reverence is a result of virtue, of fear of the Lord; lack of reverence, lack of fear brings humiliation to Israel. Repentance, fear of the Lord, will restore glory. It is this restoration, this saving intervention, that the author calls for and associates with glory: "Give new signs and work new wonders; glorify your hand and your right arm" (36,5). Sirach invokes the saving, outstretched hand and arm that brought Israel from Egypt to the promised land; by this saving act, Yahweh victor brought glory, to Himself and to His people.

Finally, Sirach turns to "praise glorious (*endoksous*) men and our forefathers... God bestowed [upon them] great glory" (44,1-2); "all these were glorified in their generations, the boast of their days... their glory will never be blotted out" (44,6.13). Not only were these men glorious for their accomplishments for Israel; they were glorious, too, because "they were men of [God's?] mercy whose virtues were not forgotten" (v. 10).

God “glorified Moses before kings... and shared His glory with him” (45,3). And so on, with most of the great figures — Joshua (46,2), the Judges (46,12), David (47,6), Elijah (48,4), Shem and Seth, Simon son of Jochanan (50,5.11) and, above every other living being, Adam (49,16). These ancients were glorified, and were the glory of Israel, and, we can presume, brought glory to all the people by what they were and did<sup>(21)</sup>.

### Summary

From what we have seen above, I believe the following can be a fair conclusion. Israel can boast about people who are glorious: God, kings, individual successes; they are glories of Israel. At the same time Israel also expresses its hope that it will be viewed as glorious. While Israel's great heroes are often described as glorious, and can easily be conceived as glories of Israel, it comes clear, perhaps from the later sorrowful history of Israel, that cherished glory was a glory lost with bitter humiliation taking its place. The main cause of lost glory was sin, so the chief demand of God was repentance. With repentance and the saving intervention of God, Israel could be restored to its place of favor, often a restoration which, in the light of the above texts, could be fairly called glorification. Thus, while individuals, groups and the entire people can be called glorious, glory was for centuries also thought of as a quality still to be regained for the people through the actions of a Savior, through the good deeds and virtues of those inspired by, obedient to, and acting for God. It is against this background of expectation and hope that one might most profitably understand the linking Luke has made between Jesus, savior, and Jesus, in Israel's case, the glory of God's people<sup>(22)</sup>. This we must now consider more carefully.

<sup>(21)</sup> In the spirit of certain strains of the Old Testament writings, one can observe with S. MUÑOZ IGLESIAS, *Los Cánticos del Evangelio de la Infancia según San Lucas* (Madrid 1983) 314: “El autor del *Nunc Dimittis* sabe que los bienes mesiánicos van a ser para todos. Pero ello no le impide sentir el legítimo orgullo de ser judío. Y por eso ve en la salvación que está cantando un motivo de gloria para el pueblo de Israel”.

<sup>(22)</sup> M. GOULDER, *Luke, a New Paradigm*, vol. II (Sheffield 1989) 262, refers to “the building of the Cantic round the thought of a single OT passage [Isa 40,1-5, cited on p.257]...”. As I have tried to suggest thus far

## II. Glory and the Lucan Works

In the Lucan works the noun "glory" appears seventeen times — thirteen in the Gospel and four in Acts; the verb "to glorify" appears fourteen times — nine in the Gospel and five in Acts. All told, noun and verb appear thirty-one times in Luke-Acts. Only six of these are, however, important for this essay.

A first study of these 31 uses of verb and noun would eliminate five from consideration (Luke 2,32; 4,6; 12,27; 24,10; Acts 4,15). From the remaining 26 texts another 12 can be eliminated because they do not associate, as does our text, Jesus with glory (Luke 2,20; 5,25.26; 7,16; 13,13; 17,15; 18,43; 23,47; Acts 4,21; 11,18; 13,48; 21,20). These 12 texts are important, however, because they continue what was expressed so often in the Jewish tradition preceding the New Testament, that glory belongs to God (and to His word [Acts 13,48]) and is to be given to Him.

Further definition can be given to these remaining 14 texts; while eight of these significantly treat of glory in relation to salvation, eventually the other six texts will be most relevant for this essay's goals.

One can associate the glory of the Lord which shone about the shepherds (Luke 2,9) and the glory of the light which shone about Paul (Acts 22,11) with the glory in which Elijah and Moses appeared at the Transfiguration (Luke 9,31). These various appearances of glory can be considered signals of salvific intervention: God on behalf of His people, for the moment represented by the shepherds, the divine intervention by which Paul was chosen for Jesus' salvific intentions, the glorious state of faithful Moses and Elijah, whose glorious condition is juxtaposed to the discussion of Jesus' (saving) *eksodos*.

Three times in the Gospel glory is the expression of what can be called saving intervention. The angels wish glory in the highest at the birth of Jesus (Luke 2,14), the disappointment in the nine who did not glorify God when cured of leprosy (Luke 17,18), the wish again for glory in the highest (Luke 19,38), this time at the King's descent upon his city, Jerusalem. One can add here the reference in Acts to

---

in this essay, it seems to me too limiting to propose a single text, even if others be joined to it, as the basis of Luke's thought about glory. Later, GOULDER, *Luke*, adds that Luke "embroiders it [Isa 40,1-5] from other passages in Isaiah, and elsewhere" (257).

Agrippa I's failure to give the glory to God (Acts 12,23), though this, unlike the rest above, is unconnected with saving intervention. On the other hand, one understands, from the salvific orientation of the list of texts above, that Stephen's introducing his defense by calling God "the Lord of Glory" (Acts 7,2) may be a less than subtle attempt on the witness's part to link, still once more in Israel's tradition, the glory of God and His saving intervention (which the speech subsequently details).

But the texts which treat of glory in a way most significant for this essay are the following:

Luke 9,26: "when the Son of Man comes in his glory and that of his Father and his holy angels".

Luke 9,32: "they saw his glory and the two men standing with him".

Luke 21,27: "people will see the Son of Man coming on a cloud with great power and glory".

Luke 24,26: "Was it not these things that the Messiah had to suffer and did he not have to enter into his glory?".

Acts 3,13: "The God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, the God of our fathers, made his servant Jesus glorious".

Acts 7,55: "He saw the glory of God and Jesus standing at God's right hand, and said, 'I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing at God's right hand'".

It is with these texts in mind that the continuity/discontinuity with the Jewish tradition, summarized above, can be measured, and we can grasp what Luke intends when he identifies Jesus Savior as the glory of God's people Israel.

First, Acts 7,55 speaks of the glory of God; are we not interested in the glory of Jesus? On the one hand, one must hold as possible that Luke, for speech and for story, has something of a source for Stephen, which may cause Luke to alter his own manner of expression. On the other hand, it is clear from Stephen's words that the glory involved includes both God and the Son of Man. Though the Ancient of Days, according to Daniel 7, was not said to be "in glory", yet the Ancient of Days bestows glory on the One like a Son of Man upon his arrival; thus, glory can be said to be a part of Daniel's concern in this vision. There is a similar presentation in Acts 3,13, where glory is bestowed on Jesus by the God of our fathers.

Secondly, with the above first point in mind, we can say that all six of these Lucan texts speak of Jesus' own glory. True, Luke

(again a source may be intrusive here) notes about the Son of Man<sup>(23)</sup> that he will come in a glory which is his and his Father's and the angels' (Luke 9,26). Nonetheless, Luke clearly and often speaks of Jesus' own glory.

Thirdly, in Luke 9,32; 24,26 and Acts 3,13, glory is the goal and characteristic of the resurrected, ascended Jesus. Luke 9,32 is a prolepsis in this regard. More specifically and more appositely, glory in these three texts is the outcome of the humiliation and suffering of Jesus. Glorious is how Jesus is seen at the Transfiguration, while speaking about his *eksodos*, a time of his suffering as well as of his freedom, in accord with the figures of Moses and Elijah. The characteristic of the Messiah is that he has to die and has to enter his glory — in that order. The God of our fathers made his servant glorious, "whom you handed over and denied" (Acts 3,13). Thus, glory is the outcome of suffering.

In the three other texts, Luke 9,26; 21,27 and Acts 7,55, glory is clearly associated with the figure of the Son of Man who is (twice) referred to in his role as judge, and probably, in Acts 7,55, is meant to be seen, at least proleptically and in part, as judge. Of the other three texts, glory is associated with the servant (Acts 3,13), with the *eksodos* (Luke 9,32), with the Messiah (24,26). Yet, one would not be hard put to integrate these three texts under the rubric of Son of Man. The servant, like the Son of Man, must suffer so as to "let others, the guilty, go free". The Messiah, already identified as Lord, as Peter noted, by virtue of the ascension, can also be identified as Son of Man, since Luke (Chapter 24) so writes as to appear to be willing to describe the dead and risen Jesus as Messiah and/or Son of Man (24,7.26.46); the passion predictions of Luke 9,22.44; 17,24-25; 18,31-32 all speak of the Son of Man dying and rising — terms, in Luke 24,26.46, associated with the Messiah. It is not my intention to make Luke eliminate titles where he did not eliminate them; yet one can acknowledge a certain degree of community in the events which give rise to diverse titles, and so titles can permissibly be allowed to overlap, with due care taken.

Fourthly, it is not my intention to draw the conclusion that glory is associated with Jesus solely under title of Son of Man; that

(23) Cf. J. KINGSBURY, "Observations on 'the Son of Man' in the Gospel according to Luke", *Currents in Theology and Mission* 17 (1990) 283-290.



would be too narrow a restatement of what Luke has written. Son of Man, Messiah, Servant, the one whose *eksodos* Elijah and Moses have spoken about — it is in the range of these titles that glory is characteristic of Jesus in Luke.

On the basis of the four observations above, I conclude that the common denominator of these six Lucan texts is this, that Jesus' glory is closely associated with, and cannot be separated from, humiliation and death in obedience to the will of God expressed in the Scriptures and made ever clearer to Jesus in his personal experiences. Each of the titles — Son of Man, Messiah, Servant, one spoken of by Moses and Elijah — is clearly preceded by a reference to suffering, as though to exemplify what was said in Acts in a different context, "It is necessary that we enter the kingdom of God through many trials" (14,22). One cannot justly separate humiliation from glory in the case of Jesus in Luke.

### III. Luke and the Jewish Scriptures

At what point(s) can we say that Luke-Acts intersects the Jewish Scriptures in the matter of glory?

First, Luke notably has his characters give the glory to God; as seen above, this is very proper human performance, expected of Jew and Gentile, throughout the Jewish Scriptures.

Secondly, both Luke and at least certain Jewish Scriptures find glory to be the outcome of suffering. In the case of the Jewish people, the suffering was, in the main, the exiles and certain ugly subsequent situations; in the case of Jesus, the suffering was all that had to do with his death. Thus, the axis "humiliation/glory", developed in the Old Testament, helped Luke to make sense of the "tragico-glorious" events associated with the abrupt end-events of the Jesus experience. It was through his ascension that Jesus came to possess his own glory, a glory which will be seen by all when Judgement comes<sup>(24)</sup>.

Thirdly, the choosing of the value "glory" is in line with the value put on glory that one finds throughout the Jewish Scriptures;

(24) Cf. FARRIS, *Hymns* 160: "In a sense these hymns [Magnificat, Benedictus, Nunc Dimittis], like the one whose coming they honour, are, therefore,

a light for revelation to the Gentiles  
and glory for your people Israel".

again, today one may be inclined to characterize life in the "age to come" with a different symbol, but Luke, in harmony with the Jewish Scriptures, continues to suggest that a value which justly summarizes the wonderfulness of the next life is glory.

A fourth conclusion to be drawn calls for an awareness of the difference between Luke and the Jewish Scriptures. Many Old Testament texts, some of which are cited above, closely link humiliation ("glory lost") with sin, and the restoration of glory with repentance. Certainly, Jesus' sense of mission involved the calling to repentance and forgiveness of sins, but his humiliation and death, his deprivation of glory, is not ascribable to his personal sins. Titles such as Servant and remarks at the Last Supper (22,19-20) and at Miletus (Acts 20,28) indicate Luke's awareness of the long-established interpretation of Jesus' death as redemptive of others who could not free themselves from the consequences of their sins. What Luke has done, like others in the New Testament, is transmute the glory which stands at the end of sin/ humiliation/ repentance to a glory of one person which ends his humiliation undergone for the sin of, and in hope of the repentance of others. Indeed, in virtue of his obedience to the plan of God, Jesus is now the one on whom each person is to call to be saved, for there is no other name on earth given to human beings by which they are to be saved (Acts 4,12)<sup>(25)</sup>.

But I think it noteworthy that salvation through Jesus is never depicted by Luke as "glory", though it is obvious, from the texts cited earlier, that the Old Testament often thinks of salvation this way<sup>(26)</sup>. Jesus "entered his glory", but Christians are never described that way, even though one might think that, with so many Lucan ways of describing salvation, one of them would be glory<sup>(27)</sup>.

<sup>(25)</sup> Cf. R. SUMMERS, *Commentary on Luke* (Waco 1972) 41: "– the child would be... a redeeming glory to the Jews".

<sup>(26)</sup> Cf. K. RENGSTORF, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD 3, Göttingen 1967) 47: "Da es [Heil] aber aus Israel kommt, so wird die Gewinnung der Völker für Gott auch sein erwähltes Volk verherrlichen".

<sup>(27)</sup> The prophet Daniel associates the glory of the One like a Son of Man with judgment; since the One like a Son of Man is, for Daniel, Israel glorified, Daniel's clear message is that Israel in glory will judge the world. Luke alone suggests that someday "...you (those at the Last Supper with Jesus) will sit on thrones to judge the twelve tribes of Israel" (Luke 22,30) (cf. 1 Cor 6,2-3). However, Luke does not describe those judging at that time as glorious.

I suppose one could, through a series of juxtapositions, ultimately argue to the probability that Christians, too, according to Luke will "enter into their glory". Yet Luke has none of this explicitly, when indeed he easily might have.

The conclusion, then, seems clear. When Simeon described Jesus as the Savior, the glory of Israel, he did not mean to anticipate that later in his work the reader would hear of a glorification of Israel through the Savior. Nor did he in his later work depict any segment of Israel glorifying Jesus. I think Luke hoped that the description from Simeon would bring to the reader's mind the various senses of "glory" used in the Old Testament, evidenced in nucleus in the first part of this essay, and that the reader would be satisfied with this and only this, i.e., with no reference in the rest of Luke's work to any but God's and Jesus' glory. In other words, in a section of the Gospel where many terms are really announcements of what will be developed in some thematic fashion in Luke-Acts, "glory" functions atypically: it will not appear again, whether to describe Jews saved by the Savior or to describe Jews glorifying Jesus for saving them<sup>(28)</sup>. The understanding of glory, given in the first part of this essay, then, is key to understanding "the Savior, the glory of your people Israel"; what the Gospel and Acts contributes is the fact that Jesus is glorified, the Savior is glorified, and this is the outcome of faithfulness through humiliation. If one wished to say the Jewish believers are glorified, one may surely say

<sup>(28)</sup> In the scenes preceding the Presentation in the Temple, there are certain points to note. Elizabeth notes that her shame has been removed (Luke 1,25), suggesting strongly a relationship between the saving intervention of God and humiliation, which is the reverse side, in so much of the Old Testament, of glory. In reflection on what has been done to her, Mary (Luke 1,47-48) joins "God my Savior" with her being raised from her lowly state, so that all people will henceforth call her blessed; this suggests divine intervention which removes humiliation to replace it with something which can be linked with glory. One effect of the birth of the Savior who is Christ Lord is the call for "glory to God in the highest" (2.14). And eventually we will find a saying attached to more than one teaching of Jesus, that not only will the first be last and the last first (Luke 13,30), but that he who exalts himself will be humbled, who humbles himself will be exalted (Luke 14,11; 18,14; cf. 1,52). One might try to make of these and other statements of the Lucan work an argument that Luke did think in terms of glory when he thought of the reversal of humiliation and humble status; but the argument does not seem to me evidently Lucan.

so, but on the basis of the Old Testament meaning of glory, not on the basis of the rest of Luke-Acts.

Something similar can be said from another Lucan perspective. In the Old Testament, glory was realizable for the Jewish people once Israel was repentant<sup>(29)</sup>. Certainly, this step towards glorification is asked of Israel in Luke-Acts. The call to take up one's cross every day and thus to follow Jesus indicates that the way to where Jesus is, is the way of the disciple to him<sup>(30)</sup>. While glory is not used here, certainly this crucial step is called for. Perhaps to take this step should, in the long run, be enough to suggest that imitation of the Servant, the Son of Man, the Messiah in humiliation and sacrifice will issue, from the Old Testament point of view, in the glorification of the believer<sup>(31)</sup>.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
00187 Rome

John J. KILGALLEN, SJ

### SOMMAIRE

Souvent, l'expression « gloire de ton peuple Israël » (Lc 2,32) est comprise comme faisant partie de certaines références isaïennes à la lumière et à la gloire. Cet article passe en revue le large champ sémantique du concept vétérotestamentaire de « gloire » en ses nombreuses acceptions; il suggère que l'on comprend Lc 2,32 si on perçoit, à l'arrière-fond de ce que Luc fait dire à Siméon, toute la richesse sémantique du mot « gloire », et non seulement celle des textes isaïens. En outre, l'article veut montrer comment, selon Luc, Jésus peut offrir la « gloire » à son peuple: c'est lorsque le terme « gloire », dans son acception lucanienne, est appliqué au disciple (l'Israël fidèle); cette « gloire », Jésus lui-même l'a en fait acquise par sa mort.

<sup>(29)</sup> Cf. J. ERNST, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (RNT 3; Regensburg 1977) 70: "Für Israel bedeutet die Rettung Zuwendung der Gottesherrlichkeit. Jener himmlische Glanz, dessen Strahlen... auf die Hirten gefallen ist, weitet sich aus auf das ganze Volk der Erwählung. Israel ist für die Heiden Mittler des Lichtes, der Herrlichkeit, d.h. der Rettung".

<sup>(30)</sup> Cf. RENGSTORF, *Evangelium*, 47: "...wer glaubt, auch bleibt (Jes. 7,9) und mitverherrlicht wird (Rom 8,17)".

<sup>(31)</sup> In commenting on Daniel 7, GOLDINGAY, *Daniel*, 193, concludes: "The affliction and the glory of Christ are not just consecutive. The affliction manifests a peculiar form of glory; the glory has the marks of the cross about it. Perhaps the same is true for the holy ones [of Daniel 7]: not just affliction (v.21) then glory (v.22), but a rule exercised in a strange, cross-like way".

## What Role Does Jesus' Saying in Acts 20,35 Play in Paul's Address to the Ephesian Elders?

The scope of this article is to determine the role which Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35, "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν)<sup>(1)</sup> plays in Paul's address to the Ephesian elders (Acts 20,17-38). It will be argued that it constitutes an integral part of the speech.

### I. Acts 20,35 Does Not Seem to Fit Easily into the Speech

The interpretations offered by a number of authors reveal that they do not see Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35 as fitting easily into the speech. For instance, E. Haenchen speaks of the beginning of v. 35 as "the connection of thought with what precedes is not very close"<sup>(2)</sup> and J. Dupont in his proposed structure of the speech claims the following sections: vv. 18-21, 22-24, 25-28, 29-31; v. 32 functions as a conclusion, and 33-35 are a complement or an addition<sup>(3)</sup>. On the other hand, some authors recognize the

<sup>(1)</sup> This article will not discuss the origin of the saying. J. J. KILGALLAN, "Acts 20:35 and Thucydides 2.97.4", *JBL* 112 [1993] 291-293, criticizes the contention that the saying depends on a passage from Thucydides. But see also E. PLÜMACHER, "Eine Thukydidesreminiszenz in der Apostelgeschichte (Act 20,33-35 – Thuk. II 97,3f.)", *ZNW* 83 (1992) 270-275. The English translations of the Bible in this article are based on *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments, New Revised Standard Version: Catholic Edition* (Nashville, TN 1993). These are modified only when they do not appear to be accurate or are misleading, and then the translation is my own.

<sup>(2)</sup> E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia 1971) 594. For a similar understanding, see H. CONZELMANN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HNT 7; Tübingen 1972) 129. See also C. K. BARRETT, "Paul's Address to the Ephesian Elders", *God's Christ and His People. Studies in Honour of N. A. Dahls* (eds. J. JERVELL – W. A. MEEKS) (Oslo 1977) 116.

<sup>(3)</sup> J. DUPONT, "La construction du Discours de Milet", *Nouvelles Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* (LD 118; Paris 1984) 441; cf. 442-445. See

importance of Jesus' saying, but give no detailed explanation of their interpretation<sup>(4)</sup>; and D.F. Watson sees the speech as carefully crafted and structured according to the Greco-Roman conventions of epideictic rhetoric<sup>(5)</sup>.

There are indications that v.35 fits integrally into the speech. Four considerations support this assertion: the nature of the saying itself, how Luke links the saying with the speech, parallels in Luke-Acts and the fact that Jesus' saying summarizes the thought of the speech.

## II. The Nature of Jesus' Saying in Acts 20,35

Let us first place Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35 into its more general category. H.-J. Degenhardt identifies three typical aspects of Luke's redactional activity of passages which deal with possessions and their renunciation: the transfer of Jesus' instructions to his disciples to the church leaders of Luke's time and the development of these instructions into conditions for entry into the community, challenges and advice for disciples and directives for mission, and

---

also his *Le discours de Milet: Testament pastoral de Saint Paul (Actes 20,18-36)* (LD 32; Paris, 1962) 22-26, 235, 285; J. JÜNGST, *Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte* (Gotha 1895) 175; O.KNOCH, *Die "Testamente" des Petrus und Paulus* (SBS 62; Stuttgart 1973) 33.

(<sup>4</sup>) E.g., J.L. D'ARAGON, "'Il faut soutenir les faibles' (Actes 20:35)", *ScEccl* 7 (1955) 194-203; F.F. BRUCE, *The Book of the Acts* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI reprint 1987) 418; G. STÄHLIN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD 5; Göttingen 1970) 271-272. L. AEJMELEUS, *Die Rezeption der Paulusbriefe in der Miletrede (Apg 20:18-35)* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B. 232; Helsinki 1987) 181-183, 221-223 and C. GHIDELLI, "Il discorso di Mileto, Testamento pastorale di S. Paolo (Atti 20,17-38)", *Introduzione alla Bibbia con antologia esegetica V.i* (Torino 1966) 129, have considered the matter in more detail, but do not show the relationship of the saying to the rest of the speech. Although they see a conclusion in v. 32, H.-J. MICHEL, *Die Abschiedsrede des Paulus an die Kirche, Apg 20,17-38* (SANT 35; München 1973) 90 and F. PRAST, *Presbyter und Evangelium in nachapostolischer Zeit. Die Abschiedsrede des Paulus in Milet (Apg 20,17-38) im Rahmen der lukanischen Konzeption der Evangeliumsverkündigung* (FB 29; Stuttgart 1979) 149-150, recognize that Luke through Jesus' saying adds to the thought of the speech.

(<sup>5</sup>) D.F. WATSON, "Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders (Acts 20.17-38): Epideictic Rhetoric of Farewell", *Persuasive Artistry* (JSNTSS 50; Sheffield 1991) 191-192; cf. 191-208.

stressing charitable activity for the pagan-Christian churches<sup>(6)</sup>. Surely, "It is more blessed to give than to receive" represents the transfer of an instruction of Jesus from his earthly life to Paul and now to the Ephesian elders. With this saying Paul also challenges and advises the Ephesian elders as regards the mission and calls them to charitable activity.

"It is more blessed to give than to receive" is a saying of Jesus which differs from beatitudes in being impersonal<sup>(7)</sup> and not absolute because it allows of "more" and "less"<sup>(8)</sup>. However, J. L. D'Aragon suggests that what is intended is not a comparison, a more or less, but an antithesis; and so the blessing goes only with "to give", not with "to receive"; thus, it would be closer to the beatitudes<sup>(9)</sup>. Even if D'Aragon is mistaken, Jesus' saying is best understood in terms of the beatitudes. Certainly, it cannot be totally impersonal because the blessing obviously relates to the individuals who give rather than receive; for normally, "blessed" (μακάριος) and its cognates refer to "the distinctive religious joy which accrues to someone from his share in the salvation of the kingdom of God"<sup>(10)</sup>. In Acts 20,35, it is the joy or satisfaction experienced primarily by Christian elders who are disposed to give more than to receive. Paul himself exemplifies this in vv. 33-34, for he desired no one's silver, gold or fine garments, and his hands served not only his own needs but also those of his collaborators. "In all this I have given you an example that by such hard work we must help the weak" (v. 35a) explains Paul's attitude toward any financial gain that resulted from his labors. Actually, "by such hard work we must help the weak" reappears generalized in "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (v. 35b)<sup>(11)</sup>.

<sup>(6)</sup> H.-J. DEGENHARDT, *Lukas – Evangelist der Armen: Besitz und Besitzverzicht in den lukanischen Schriften* (Stuttgart 1965) 214-215. W. SCHMITHALS, "Lukas – Evangelist der Armen", *TViat* 12 (1975) 153-167, overstates the importance of the relationship between persecution and treatment of possessions and their renunciation.

<sup>(7)</sup> STÄHLIN, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 271-272.

<sup>(8)</sup> E. CORTÈS, *Los discursos de Adiós de Gen 49 a Jn 13-17* (Barcelona 1976) 421.

<sup>(9)</sup> D'ARAGON, "Il faut soutenir les faibles", 199-201. But see H.-J. DEGENHARDT, *Lukas-Evangelist*, 175. See also J. JEREMIAS, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus* (London 1958) 78-81 and DUPONT, *Le discours de Milet*, 333-335.

<sup>(10)</sup> F. HAUCK, "Μακάριος", *TDNT* IV, 367.

<sup>(11)</sup> B. J. MALINA and J. H. NEYREY, "First-Century Personality:

The saying of Jesus, cited by Paul in his speech to the Ephesian elders, resembles the beatitudes because it is not specific and so allows of numerous applications. In fact, most Greco-Roman farewell-addresses were not extensive, but consisted in the person's "last word" (usually a clever epigram) and a description of his death. This "last word", which summed up the person's life<sup>(12)</sup>, again recalls Acts 20,35, "In all of this I have given you an example that by such work we must support the weak, remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, for he himself said, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive'".

### III. How Luke Links the Saying with the Speech

There are very few data to substantiate any charge that Luke is a careless writer. Consequently, his placement of Jesus' saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive" should not a priori be judged as careless or not well connected with the speech. On the contrary, a saying at the very end of a speech might well function as a climax or a summary. Moreover, Luke does not make additions to the speeches in Acts; and even if Acts 20,33-35 were an addition to the speech, we would still have to ask how well Luke did this. Moreover, "In all this I have given you an example", which precedes Jesus' saying, calls for two observations. The saying is in a context of Paul's example, already suggested in v.31, but many scholars would say that thought characterizes the whole speech. "In all this" would take on a much broader meaning<sup>(13)</sup>, should we be able to connect Jesus' saying to the whole of the speech. Moreover, the phrase, "remembering the words of the Lord Jesus" (μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν), which occurs immediately before Jesus' saying, highlights it and clarifies Paul's motivation for assisting the weak. It likewise recalls "remembering" and Paul's implied example in v.31 and earlier similar Lucan statements about remembering Jesus' words (Luke 22,61; 24,6-8,44; Acts 11,16). The reference to the plural "words" carries the nuance that we are not only to think of the word of Jesus

---

Dyadic, Not Individualistic", *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (ed. J.H. Neyrey) (Peabody, MA 1991) 91, call Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35 an aphorism.

<sup>(12)</sup> W.S. KURZ, "Luke 22.14-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses", *JBL* 104 (1985) 255, 261, 267.

<sup>(13)</sup> For example, see F. PRAST, *Presbyter und Evangelium*, 152-153; cf. 197.



cited but whatever he had to say<sup>(14)</sup>. The nearest referent to τὸν λόγον of v. 35 is in v. 32, "to the message of his grace (τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ), a message that is able to build you up and to give you the inheritance among all who are sanctified". In each passage we find a form of ὁ λόγος related to the concept of "giving". Of course, in v. 32 the reference is to God's word and in v. 35 to Jesus' words; yet τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ of v. 32 bears a strong resemblance to what is said of Jesus in Luke 4,22, "All spoke well of him and were amazed at the words of grace which came from his mouth" (ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ). Luke has predicated very similar expressions of God and of Jesus, and this supports our conclusion that Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35 embraces the thought in Acts 20,32 that the power of God's word can build up the Ephesian elders and give them a share among the sanctified. Of course, the implication is that God will give them the inheritance among the sanctified, but he receives nothing from them. This understanding is supported by another close parallel to "the words of his grace" (Acts 20,32), namely, "to the gospel of God's grace" (v. 24: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ); for the gospel is something God gives, not that he receives.

By placing Jesus' saying at the end of Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders, Luke can bring up the resurrection. Of course, he already did this in v. 32 when he wrote of the inheritance among all those who are sanctified; but through "blessed" in the saying of v. 35, he can reintroduce the thought and end his speech on this positive note. The resurrection, either Jesus' or that of the Christians, is one of Luke's favorite themes in the speeches in Acts<sup>(15)</sup>.

(14) Ibid., 154-155, 226, 232-233. 261, 348-349. See also J. LAMBRECHT, "Paul's Farewell Address at Miletus (Acts 20,17-38)", *Les Actes des Apôtres: Tradition, rédaction, théologie* (ed. J. KREMER) (BETL 48; Leuven 1979) 326. The observations of John Chrysostom, *Τοῦ ἐν Ἀγίοις Πατράς Ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσόστομου τὰ Εὐρισκόμενα πάντα* (Paris 1870) XV, 315, about Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35 lead in this same direction, "And where did he say this? Perhaps the apostles handed (this saying) down orally or certain (NT) passages led to this conclusion".

(15) E.g., Acts 2,24-36; 3,15.20-26; 4,10-12; 5,30-32; 7,55-60; 8,30-35; 10,40-43; 13,32-39; 17,31-32; 23,6; 24,14-15,21; 26,6-8.22-23 (cf. 25,19); 28,20.

#### IV. Significant Parallels to Jesus' Saying in Acts 20,35

The parallels in the rest of Luke-Acts to Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35 suggest its importance in Paul's speech at Miletus because an attitude of giving and financial assistance for the weak or poor are definite Lucan concerns, and below we will be able to demonstrate that these concerns permeate the speech. As we view these parallels, Luke's meaning for "blessed" (μακάριος) and his use of "to give" (διδόναι) merit our attention. When the crowd asks John the Baptist what they should do, he replies, "Let the man with two coats give to him who has none" (μεταδότην τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι). "The man who has food should do the same" (Luke 3,11). This verse is unique to Luke and contains the same concern as Acts 20,35, helping the weak. The one who has is to give to the one who does not have.

We find parallels between the beatitudes in Luke's Gospel, especially Luke 6,20; 12,32-33.37-38.43; 14,12-14 and Acts 20,35. Surely, Luke 6,20 (cf. v. 24), "Blessed (Μακάριοι) are you who are poor; for yours is the kingdom of God" parallels Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35. Both sayings connect being "blessed" with the relationship that one has to possessions, but Luke 6,20 makes more explicit the eschatological dimension because it clearly relates "blessed" with participation in the kingdom of God.

Luke 6,27-38 (esp. vv. 30.35-36.38) likewise offer a parallel to Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35. Christians are to give to everyone who asks (παντὶ αἰτοῦντι σε δίδου), and if something is taken from them, not to demand it back (v. 30). They are to love their enemies and do good; and only Luke adds, "lend, expecting nothing in return" (δανίζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες) and mentions a great reward. Then their recompense will be great and they will be sons of the Most High whose goodness reaches out to the ungrateful and the wicked (v. 35bcd: ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηρούς). Christians are to be compassionate as their Father is compassionate. In this spirit, they are instructed in v. 38 (cf. 12,31) to give and it will be given to them (δίδετε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν) in superabundance, yet they are also warned the measure with which they measure will be measured back to them. According to Luke 6,30.35-36.38, Christians are to give without expecting anything in return. This makes them like God, and for Luke giving is one of

God's characteristics<sup>(16)</sup>. It also leads to a divine reward; and in fact, they will receive as they have given. So, by means of the Jesus-saying in Acts 20,35 Luke through Paul calls the elders (and everyone) to be like the Father who gives and is good to all, and their being "blessed" for so doing carries a nuance of reward.

Later Jesus tells his disciples whom he calls "little flock" not to fear because the Father wants to *give* them the kingdom (δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν). They, on their part, are to sell their possessions and *give* alms (Πωλήσατε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν καὶ δότε ἐλεημοσύνην); to get purses that will not wear out, a never-failing treasure with the Lord which no thief comes near nor any moth destroys (Luke 12,32-33; cf. 11,41). Further along in the same chapter, in the watchful servant pericope (vv. 35-48) three times "blessed" (μακάριος) describes the servants whom the Lord finds watching and doing what they should (vv. 37-38.43). The first two instances are unique to Luke, and the last one is of particular interest to us. It occurs in the section, vv. 41-48, which according to many scholars deals with leadership<sup>(17)</sup> in the later community and warns the leaders not to mistreat their fellow Christians nor to eat or drink excessively because the Lord will come at a time they do not expect. Jesus asks, "Who then is the faithful and prudent manager whom his master will put in charge of his slaves, to give (διδόναι) them their allowance of food at the proper time?" (v. 42). He then proclaims, "Blessed (μακάριος) is that slave whom his master will find at work when he arrives" (v. 43). Since we know from v. 40 that the "Lord" refers to the coming of the Son of Man and so to Jesus and that only Luke in vv. 41-42 writes of Jesus as "Lord", we have a situation very similar to what we find in the dominical saying of Acts 20,35: Jesus declares someone blessed for giving to others. After discussing the reward that the faithful servant will receive and the various punishments of unfaithful ones, Jesus concludes with words

<sup>(16)</sup> See Luke 1,32.74; 6,38; 8,10.18; 11,3.9-13.29; 12,32.48; 19,26; 20,2.16; Acts 2,19.27; 4,12.29; 5,32; 7,5.8.10.25; 8,18; 10,40; 11,17-18; 13,20-21.34-35; 14,17; 15,8; 17,25; 20,32. Giving also characterizes Jesus: Luke 7,15; 9,1.16; 10,19; 12,51; 21,15; 22,19; Acts 5,31; 14,3.

<sup>(17)</sup> E.g., C. F. EVANS, *Saint Luke* (Philadelphia 1990) 536; J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV* (Garden City, NY 1985) 989; L. T. JOHNSON, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, MN 1991) 204, 206; PRAST, *Presbyter und Evangelium*, 227, 234-248, 260-262, 349; NEYREY (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, 174-175, 227, 253-254, 260.

found only in Luke, "From everyone to whom much has been given, much will be required; and from the one to whom much has been entrusted, even more will be demanded" (v.48b: παντὶ δὲ ᾧ ἐδόθη πολὺ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ᾧ παρέθεντο πολὺ, περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτόν). We have Hebrew parallelism, and the basic idea, God will require much of anyone to whom he has given much, is stated twice. Consequently, Luke 12,32-33, 35-48, of which vv. 41-48 probably consider church leadership, are eschatological scenes which remind us that God gives and Christians should give, too. If they do this, they will be "blessed" and rewarded, when the Lord (Jesus) comes. All are advised that, if God has given them much, he will expect much. Of course, "little flock" (v.32; cf. Acts 20,28-29) and the probable reference to church leadership strengthen the connection between these verses and Jesus' saying in the speech to the Ephesian elders. The immediate relationship is clear enough: the leader's giving to those of the flock in need leads to being "blessed", which is an eschatological concept and implies a reward.

In the lesson to the guests and host at a banquet (Luke 14,7-14), which is unique to Luke, Jesus advises the host to invite to such an affair not his friends, relatives nor those who can repay him, but beggars, cripples, the lame and the blind; for then he will be blessed (μακάριος) because they cannot repay (ἀνταποδοῦναι) him and he will be repaid (ἀνταποδοθήσεται) at the resurrection of the just (Luke 14,13-14; cf. v. 12). As in Acts 20,35, blessedness is joined with assisting the poor; but the notion of a reward, connected with being "blessed", is more explicit.

Not only beatitudes provide parallels to Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35. There are other parallels, and the two examples given in this paragraph are unique to Luke. Among the ways in which the Good Samaritan proves himself a neighbor to the man who fell into the hands of robbers are: "The next day he took out two denarii and gave (ἔδωκεν) them to the innkeeper and said, 'Take care of him; and when I come back, I will repay (ἀποδώσω) you whatever more you spend'" (Luke 10,35). Later in the Gospel, Jesus' advice to the Pharisees, leaders of the Jewish people who were overly concerned about purification, is the puzzling: "So give (δότε) for alms those things that are within; and see, everything will be clean for you" (11,41). Whatever the solution to the puzzle, the Pharisees are exhorted to give alms. In a similar passage, Jesus tells the rich ruler that he needs

to do one more thing, "Sell all that you own and distribute (διάδοϑ) the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come follow me" (Luke 18,22). Luke associates the giving of alms to the poor with a heavenly reward and makes it a prerequisite for the rich ruler's following Jesus.

Two more stories unique to Luke prove helpful for our study. In the story of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16,19-31), the text (v.21) in part explains why the rich man is condemned; for Lazarus "longed to satisfy his hunger with what fell from the rich man's table; even the dogs would come and lick his sores". The rich man was totally indifferent to Lazarus' needs and just expectations, and that is precisely his failing. The dogs treat Lazarus better. The rich man is "condemned" for not giving nor being concerned about the disadvantaged, that is, for doing the opposite of what Paul through Jesus' saying (Acts 20,35) recommends to the Ephesian elders. Much more in tune with Jesus' saying is the claim of Zacchaeus, "Look, half of my possessions, Lord, I will give (δίδωμι) to the poor; and if I have defrauded anyone of anything, I will pay back (ἀποδίδωμι) four times as much" (Luke 19,8). Despite the difficulties in interpreting this verse<sup>(18)</sup>, it remains clear that Zacchaeus is determined to share his possessions with the poor and to make very generous recompense for any dishonesty committed.

J. Lambrecht points to some strikingly identical motifs in Jesus' farewell-address at the Last Supper (Luke 22,14-38) and Paul's at Miletus. As Jesus prepares the Apostles for the time after his death, so Paul prepares the Ephesian elders. Both Jesus (Luke 22,35) and Paul (Acts 20,18-21.26-27.31) look back to the time of being with their respective audience. Both give warning and exhortation (Luke 22,24-27; Acts 20,28-31.35). Difficulties will follow on the departures of each of them and the apostles and elders must now be diligent (Luke 22,35-38; Acts 20,28-31). Jesus prays for Peter (Luke 22,32) and Paul commends the elders to God and to the word of his grace (Acts 20,32), and that God won the Church with the blood of his own son (Acts 20,28) presumably refers to "the new covenant in my blood" (Luke 22,20)<sup>(19)</sup>. But should we not see a clearer

<sup>(18)</sup> See my "The Literary Form of Luke 19:1-10", *JBL* 110 (1991) 108-109, 112, 115.

<sup>(19)</sup> J. LAMBRECHT, "Paul's Farewell-Address at Miletus", 326. See also J. ROLOFF, *Apostolat-Verkündigung-Kirche* (Gütersloh 1965) 228-231;

parallel between Luke 22,24-30, which only Luke places in the Last Supper scene, and Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35, "It is more blessed to give than to receive"?<sup>(20)</sup>. Luke 22,24-30 reads as follows:

A dispute also arose among them as to which one of them was to be regarded as the greatest. But he (Jesus) said to them, "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and those in authority over them are called benefactors. But not so with you; rather the greatest among you must become like the youngest, and the leader like the one who serves (καὶ ὁ ἡγουμένος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν). For who is greater, the one who is at the table or the one who serves (ὁ διακονῶν)? Is it not the one at the table? But I am among you as one who serves (ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν).

"You are those who have stood by me in my trials; and I confer on you, just as my Father has conferred on me, a kingdom, so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel".

As Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35, these verses are both a paraenesis which describes how the Christians should interact with one another and a promise of sharing in the kingdom. Moreover, both Jesus and Paul (cf. Acts 20,19) speak of their trials; and as Jesus holds himself up as an example at the Last Supper, so does Paul in the Miletus speech (cf. Acts 20,33-35a) prior to his reminding the elders of Jesus' saying. Certainly, in the Last Supper scene being the youngest, "like one who serves" and "But I am among you as the one who serves" go well with "giving", and lording it over others and exercising authority, being called benefactor, being the greatest and the leader and "the one who is at table" fit better an attitude of receiving. These parallels and the others between the Last Supper (Luke 22,14-38) and Acts 20,17-35 also support the contention that Jesus' saying constitutes an integral part of Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders and provides a paraenesis and a promise of sharing in the kingdom for later Christians, especially the leaders, since Jesus at the Last Supper is addressing the apostles.

---

H.-J. MICHEL, *Die Abschiedsrede des Paulus*, 63; W.S. KURZ, "Luke 22,14-38", 256-257, 260-267; J. NEYREY, *The Passion according to Luke* (Theological Inquiries; New York 1985) 43-48.

<sup>(20)</sup> ROLOFF, *Apostolat-Verkündigung-Kirche*, 228, sees parallels between Luke 22,24-27 and the διακονία, "ministry", of Paul in Acts 20,24 and the task of shepherding of the elders in vv. 28-29. See also NEYREY, *Passion*, 44.

Luke in two of his three "major summaries" (cf. Acts 2,42.44-45; 4,32.34-35) recommends that Christians share their possessions according to each one's need and tells us about Joseph to whom the apostles had given the name Barnabas ("son of encouragement") and who donated to the community the sale price of a farm he owned (Acts 4,36-37). By way of contrast, Ananias and Sapphira could not bring themselves to give the full sale price of their piece of property (cf. Acts 5,1-11). So Joseph, a community leader nicknamed "son of encouragement", exemplifies the sharing of one's possessions with those in need while the death of Ananias and Sapphira manifests the seriousness and integrity with which such sharing is to be undertaken.

To be sure, Luke does not say much about the collection (cf. Acts 11,28-30; 12,25; 24,17), and what he does say makes us wonder if he was aware of its exact nature. Nonetheless, he knew that there was an effort on the part of the disciples of Antioch to set something aside and send it through Paul and Barnabas to the elders in Judea for the relief of their fellow Christians. In the spirit of Acts 20,35, Christians assisted by their leaders give financial support to their brothers and sisters in need. By way of contrast, Jesus denounces the scribes for their vanity, self-seeking, hypocrisy and devouring widows' houses (Luke 20,46-47).

From these parallels to Acts 20,35 and the speech at Miletus we learn that Luke often recommends giving financial assistance to the weak or poor, and at times community leaders play a part in carrying this out. The task is a serious one and should be done with integrity; there is no place for indifference in the matter. Those who help the weak and poor are "blessed", which describes the result of their attitude toward possessions, i.e., belonging to the kingdom of God. Consequently, "blessed" is an eschatological term. More generally, Luke advocates an attitude of giving which is a characteristic of God and shows us to be his sons and daughters. The Last Supper, also a farewell speech, offers a number of parallels to Paul's speech at Miletus; naturally, in view of Acts 20,35, we are especially interested in the challenge to imitate Jesus in service and not to be concerned about who is the greatest or lording it over others and in the promise of a heavenly reward. This reflection about a share in the kingdom or a heavenly reward is less explicit in the speech at Miletus, but it is contained in "blessed" and present earlier in the parallel to Jesus' saying, "a share among all those who

are sanctified by him" (Acts 20,32). Of course, these parallels suggest the importance of the saying for the speech.

#### V. Jesus' Saying in Acts 20,35 Unifies the Speech

The last words in the speech are not Paul's, but the Lord's, whose saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (v. 35), unifies and summarizes the thought of the speech. Luke underlines the intimacy between Jesus and Paul since the latter knows a teaching of Jesus entirely new to the reader of the gospels, and through his activity among the Ephesians Paul has shown how such a saying should affect a Christian's life. Let us see now how Jesus' saying unites Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders.

A. Casalegno has written an interesting article in which among other things he proposes that the dominant word in Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders is κύριος ("Lord", cf. vv. 19.21.24.35). Casalegno points out that in "serving the Lord with all humility" (v. 19), we find the divine ruler whom Paul serves; in "as I testified to ... faith toward our Lord Jesus" (v. 21), the one to whom Christian faith looks; in "the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus" (v. 24), the agent of Paul's apostolic activity. However, Casalegno interprets "Lord" in "remembering the words of the Lord Jesus" (v. 35) as a simple genitive which qualifies "the words"<sup>(21)</sup> whereas these words underline the importance of Jesus' saying. Not only Paul's attitude toward whatever money he earned, but his service of the Lord, testimony to faith in Christ and his ministry all actualize Jesus' saying about "giving". "Lord" does play a significant role in the speech, but "giving" (διδόναι) also plays an integral role in the speech.

Clearly, Luke has explicitly associated with Jesus' saying in v. 35 Paul's not seeking financial benefit but working with his hands and taking care of his own and others' needs, especially those of the weak (vv. 33-35a), for in so doing Paul has set an example for his fellow Christians by living out Jesus' saying. But now we need to pause and to reflect a moment on how Luke treats wealth and poverty. In Luke-Acts wealth and possessions are not necessarily always to be understood literally, for Luke also uses them

(<sup>21</sup>) A. CASALEGNO, "Il discorso di Mileto (Atti 20,17-38)", *RivB* 25 (1977) 38-44; cf. 29-58.



metaphorically<sup>(22)</sup>. This understanding of possessions suggests a further application of Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35. Let us consider the following statements in the speech: Paul's claim in v.24 that he places no value on his own life but only wants to complete the task (τὸν δρόμον) and service (τὴν διακονίαν) he has received from Christ, to witness to the gospel of God's grace and "the church of God, that he obtained with the blood of his own Son" (v.28: ἦν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου). Are not both of these acts of generosity, Paul's and God's through Christ, likewise instances of actualizing Jesus' saying that it is more blessed to give than to receive? The clause, "I do not count my life of any value to myself" (v.24: ἀλλ' οὐδενὸς λόγου ποιῶμαι τὴν ψυχὴν τιμίαν ἑμαυτῷ) supports our seeing a metaphorical use of financial terminology in this verse. This would also be true for God's obtaining the church through the blood of his own Son (v.28; cf. Acts 7,16; 1 Cor 6,19-20; 7,23; Rom 3,24-25; 5,19; 8,31-32; Eph 1,7) because the phrasing recalls an act of purchasing.

If one agrees that Paul's placing of no value on his own life but only on the ministry which he received from the Lord Jesus exemplifies Jesus' saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive", then he would also have to agree that the same conclusion would be true of vv. 18 to 23 since for all practical purposes their contents summarize this task and service. Moreover, the following vocabulary of this section corresponds with the notion of "giving". Paul reminds the Ephesian elders that they know how he was *always at their disposition* (v.18), *serving the Lord with all humility* even though he *had to put up with* the sorrows and trials that came his way from the plotting of certain Jews (v.19). He omitted none of the preaching that would *benefit* them and *taught them both in public and in private* (v.20). Paul *bore witness to everyone* (v.21) about repentance to God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. Finally, although the Spirit tells him that he will be a prisoner and

(22) J. GILLMAN, *Possessions and the Life of Faith* (Collegeville, MN 1991) 31-35; L. T. JOHNSON, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 39; Missoula, MT 1977) 158-161; R. F. O'TOOLE, *The Unity of Luke's Theology* (Good News Studies 9; Wilmington, DE 1984) 129-135; see also H. MOXNES, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel* (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Philadelphia 1988) 163-164.

experience hardships in Jerusalem, Paul subordinates these sufferings to the accomplishment of his ministry received from the Lord Jesus (vv. 22-23). Paul in these verses surely gives and does not receive from the Ephesian elders or from whomever they represent.

Basically, the contents of vv. 18-23 are again repeated in vv. 25-27.31, and so these verses, too, are an actualization of Jesus' saying in v. 35. This conclusion finds support in a review of the vocabulary. The Ephesian elders will no longer see the face of Paul among all of whom he went *preaching the kingdom* (v. 25). In fact, Paul has been so diligent in his ministry among them that he can solemnly testify that he takes the blame for no one's conscience (v. 26) which statement Luke supports in v. 27 through repetition of some of the same vocabulary used in v. 20 (ὅπερ στείλαμην τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι... ὑμῖν) and by stressing that Paul never shrank from *announcing to them God's design in its entirety*. In v. 31 Luke hyperbolically summarizes and underlines the length and intensity of Paul's ministry — to the point of *never ceasing to warn, even to the point of tears, each of them*. The "tears" and "warning each of them" illustrate the quality of Paul's ministry and his care and concern for each individual. Consequently, vv. 25-27.31 report how Paul gave and did not receive from the Ephesian elders. The length and intensity of his ministry, his concern for everyone and the honesty of his claim that he is not guilty of failing to make God's salvation available to everyone of them since he proclaimed the kingdom and the whole design of God, all justify such an interpretation of those verses.

Acts 20,17-18a really introduce Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders, and we have already demonstrated above that v. 32 relates an actualization of Jesus' saying since the message of God's grace can give the Ephesian elders inheritance among the sanctified. That leaves only vv. 28-30 to be explained, but when in v. 35 he spoke of his stance toward possessions and work and of Jesus' saying, "it is more blessed to give than to receive", Paul observed that "he has shown them (the elders) in every way", i.e., his activities constitute an example for the Ephesian elders. In addition, all of Paul's ministerial activity described in the speech explicitly or implicitly serves as a model for the elders and has already been verified as a living out of Jesus' saying. Consequently, the metaphorical application of Jesus' saying in v. 35 likewise embraces the ministry of the elders to their flock. True, vv. 29-30 treat Paul's prophetic

proclamation that false teachers both from outside and within the Christian community will not spare the flock but teach falsehood and try to get the disciples to follow them, and describe the difficult circumstances within which the elders must exercise their ministry. However, the vocabulary of v. 28 certainly portrays the "giving" of the elders who, other than being concerned for themselves, are to watch out for the whole flock over which the Holy Spirit has placed them as guardians to shepherd the church of God (προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμεῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ). Furthermore, the assertion that the church of God was "obtained with the blood of his son" (v. 28) challenges the elders to recognize the value in God's eyes of those they shepherd and the nobility of their ministry and to imitate the generosity of God who through the blood of his Son redeemed the church. "Watching out for the whole flock", being "guardians", "shepherding the church of God" and the implied imitation of the generosity of both God and Jesus on behalf of the church are all services that the elders are rendering their flock in the midst of false teachers; they are not examples of "receiving", but of "giving". E. Lövestam's contention that the second half of the Miletian speech (vv. 28-35) shows obvious affinity with the conceptions and motifs found in Ezek 34 supports our interpretation. According to Lövestam, Paul's final exhortations and Jesus' saying to the elders are an integral part of the picture of true shepherds, for in Ezek 34 there is a marked contrast between the faithless shepherds' way of benefitting themselves at the expense of the flock and their true task of tending it, of strengthening the weak (LXX: τὸ ἰσθενηκός), healing the sick and dressing the wounds<sup>(23)</sup>.

## VI. A Different Structure of the Speech Seems Justified

The very number of the structures proposed reveals the difficulty of the task<sup>(24)</sup>. For instance, what criteria should be used?

<sup>(23)</sup> E. LÖVESTAM, "Paul's Address at Miletus", *ST* 41 (1987) 7-8.

<sup>(24)</sup> This was already pointed out by DUPONT, *Le discours de Milet*, 21-22. For the same reflection and for a review of some of the structures proposed for the speech, see LAMBRECHT, "Paul's Farewell-Address at Miletus", 314-318; C.J. HEMER, "The Speeches of Acts: 1. The Ephesian Elders at Miletus", *TynBul* 40 (1989) 79-80; WATSON, "Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders", 187-188.

Should one consider the contents of the speech<sup>(25)</sup> or formal criteria (like time)<sup>(26)</sup>? Significant themes or ideas in the speech are: looking back and looking forward (from Paul to the elders), summary statements of the gospel message (vv. 21, 24b, 25b, 27), Paul's own integrity and innocence (vv. 18-21, 24, 26-27, 31?, 33-36)<sup>(27)</sup>, Paul as a model (e.g., vv. 34-35<sup>[28]</sup>, but really the whole speech), warning about future dangers (e.g., vv. 28-32), Paul's suffering (vv. 19, 22-25, 38), the ministry of an elder (vv. 28-31), "knowing" (vv. 18, 25, 29, 34; cf. "remembering", vv. 31, 35), witnessing (vv. 21, 23, 24, 26), assisting the weak (vv. 33-35). On the other hand, indications of time in the speech would be: "You yourselves know" (v. 18: Ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε; past time?), "And now" (v. 22: καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ; present time?), "And now I know" (v. 25: Καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ οἶδα; present, but introduces a future event) and "And now" (v. 32: καὶ τὰ νῦν; present time). The speech proper ends with v. 35 because v. 36 starts with the words, "When he had finished speaking", and there are at least six gestures of farewell in vv. 36-38: "knelt down", "prayed", "much weeping", "they embraced Paul and kissed him", "grieving... that they would not see him again" and "they brought him to the ship".

There is no need for us to review all of the structures proposed for Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders. In view of what has been said thus far, I see Lambrecht's structure as the most accurate, but in need of a slight modification. Lambrecht considers grammar, various repetitions, time references and the transition from Paul's speaking about himself (vv. 18-27) to the exhortation to the elders (vv. 28-35)<sup>(29)</sup>. His contention that vv. 18b-21 and 26-27 correspond to each other and frame a central passage vv. 22-25 merits attention as does his claim that the first part of the speech, Paul's self-defence

<sup>(25)</sup> E.g., G. SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HTK V,2; Freiburg 1982) 293.

<sup>(26)</sup> E.g., C. GHIDELLI, *Atti degli Apostoli* (La Sacra Bibbia; Italy 1978) 157; W. S. KURZ, *Farewell Addresses in the New Testament* (Collegeville, MN 1990) 34; WATSON, "Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders", 194-208.

<sup>(27)</sup> See M. DIBELIUS, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte* (ed. H. GREEVEN) (FRLANT 60; Göttingen 1957) 134-135; DUPONT, *Le Discours de Milet*, 19.

<sup>(28)</sup> Paul himself challenges his readers to imitate him; see 1 Thess 1,6; 1 Cor 4,16; 11,1; Gal 4,12; Phil 3,17; 4,9.

<sup>(29)</sup> LAMBRECHT, "Paul's Farewell-Address at Miletus", 314-318 and G. LÜDEMANN, *Das frühe Christentum nach den Traditionen der Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen 1986) 234.

and his reference to the future, should be seen in light of the paraenesis of the second part. However, such is not true of his proposal that the warning in vv. 28-31 and in 33-35 to some extent correspond to one another and frame v.32. Lambrecht's structure also would find support in the parallels which J. Roloff sees between vv. 18-27 and 28-35: service of the community (vv. 18-19, 28); witness of the word (vv. 20-21, 29-31) and uncertainty about the future (vv. 22-25, 32)<sup>(30)</sup>.

I propose the following structure for the speech which, except for the treatment of vv. 33-35, agrees with that of Lambrecht. The speech falls into three major parts which form a simple chiasm. After the introduction (vv. 17-18a), there is a summary of Paul's ministerial relationship with the Ephesians (vv. 18b-27); in the center stands his paraenesis to the elders (vv. 28-32); followed by another summary of Paul's ministerial relationship with the Ephesians, but this time explicitly in terms of his attitude toward wealth and work (vv. 33-35)<sup>(31)</sup>:

Introduction to the speech (Acts 20,17-18a).

Part I: Summary of Paul's ministerial relationship with the Ephesian elders (vv. 18b-27) which has three sections.

- A. What the Ephesian elders know about Paul (vv. 18b-21), introduced by Ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε. This is one sentence in the Greek text.
- B. Vv. 22-24 (καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ) speak of Paul's present situation, move to the Spirit's testimony of the future and then return to Paul's present reaction to this testimony.
- C. Vv. 25-27 (Καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ οἶδα) at first introduce the prophecy that the Ephesian elders will not see Paul any more (v.25bc) and then return to the present and repeat Paul's claim of innocence (vv. 26-27).

Part II: Paul's paraenesis for the Ephesian elders (vv. 28-32). The main attention is on the elders, their behavior and being entrusted by Paul to God and the word of his grace. Paul's conduct appears only as the object of a participle, "remembering", after the imperative, "Therefore be alert" (v.31).

A. V. 28: Elders should attend to themselves and to their flock.

<sup>(30)</sup> J. ROLOFF, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD 5; Göttingen 1981) 302. However, these parallels are not all that convincing.

<sup>(31)</sup> WATSON, "Paul's Speech", 204-208, designates vv. 32-35 as the "peroratio".

B. Vv. 29-30 (ἐγὼ οἶδα ὅτι) explain “why” the elders should so act: there will be opponents from without and from within.

C. V. 31 draws a conclusion from the data of vv. 29-30 in the form of an exhortation (cf. v.28), also based on the reminder (μνημονεύοντες) of Paul’s own ministerial example.

D. V. 32: Paul’s prayer on behalf of the elders. He places them in the hands of God whose word can build up and give inheritance among all the sanctified.

Part III: Paul returns to his ministry among the Ephesian elders (cf. vv. 18b-22,27,31bc) and his attitude toward wealth and work.

A. V. 33: he did not desire anyone’s wealth or possessions.

B. V. 34: αὐτοὶ γινώσκετε refers back to the phrasing of v.18b and, as that clause reveals, the Ephesian elders know and so can attest to Paul’s statement.

C. V. 35: Paul’s example which included remembering (μνημονεύειν) the Lord Jesus’ saying.

Aftermath of the speech (vv. 36-38): six gestures of farewell, the mention of prayer refers back to Paul’s prayer in v.32, notice of the elders’ deep affection for Paul, and the second and final reference to their not seeing Paul’s face again (cf. v.25).

Three pieces of evidence support the unity of the first part of the speech (vv. 18b-27): the concept of witness is limited to it (cf. vv. 21, 23, 24, 26) and so are the summaries of the gospel proclamation (vv. 21, 24, 25, 27)<sup>(32)</sup>; moreover, vv.26-27 are a parallel to v.20, esp., ὑπεστειλάμην τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι... ὑμῖν, and help to unify this part. The arguments in favor of vv. 28-32 being the second part of the speech are: the paraenesis begins and the attention is on the Ephesian elders who naturally are the subject of the imperatives (vv. 28, 31a). True, Paul enters again as the subject of the explanation (cf. vv. 29-30) of the reasonableness of the first directive; and in fact, the thought of vv. 29-30 also motivates the imperative of v.31a (διὸ γρηγορεῖτε). Nonetheless, the Ephesian elders and their behavior in the midst of opposition dominates these verses. V.31bc describes how their watching should be carried out, namely, by being alert and remembering how Paul for three years behaved among them. Some authors have claimed that v.32 marks the end of the speech, and at a minimum, this theory suggests that v.32 is not to be taken with vv. 33-35. In fact, v.32 fits well with vv. 28-31 since with God’s

<sup>(32)</sup> To be sure, “the message of his grace” (v.32) is a summary statement of the gospel, but it is not being proclaimed.

help the moral activity of the elders can arrive at the goals mentioned. Finally, Luke in vv. 33-35 returns to Paul's past, but this time addresses his attitudes toward wealth and work as a model for the elders. Since the speech clearly ends with v. 35, "aftermath" is a correct designation of vv. 36-38; and these verses forcefully bring home that God's providence governs all and that Paul's farewell is accompanied by expressions of the deep affection that he and the elders bore one another.

## VII. Conclusion

Since some authors view Acts 20,35 as only an addition or complement to Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders and others grant its importance but do not thoroughly demonstrate its relationship to the speech, this article attempts to establish how Jesus' saying fits into the speech. Although impersonal and not absolute, Jesus' saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive", resembles beatitudes and allows of numerous applications; and "blessed" conveys the joy that follows on one's share in the salvation of the kingdom of God. Moreover, Luke is a careful writer and does not make additions to the speeches in Acts. Jesus' saying stands in a context of imitation of Paul which idea characterizes the whole of the speech, and the parallel to v. 32 reveals that "giving" refers not only to the activity of Jesus and of Paul but to that of God (cf. v. 24).

Parallels in the rest of Luke-Acts support the importance of Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35<sup>(33)</sup>, for an attitude of giving is a definite concern of Luke and permeates the whole of Paul's speech at Miletus. Most all of these parallels speak of assisting the poor and of the eschatological nuance of a salvific reward, but some bring up other points. Christians are to be like God who gives and is good to all (Luke 6,27-38); and according to Luke 12,48 (cf. vv. 32- 33,37-38), how the leaders give to the other members of the flock can lead to their being "blessed" (cf. Acts 4,36-37). The parallels between the

(33) GILLMAN, *Possessions and the Life of Faith*, 111, concludes his chapter on "Possessions in the Story of the Early Church" with these words about Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35, "This expresses well an underlying conviction to so much of what Luke says in his two-volume work about possessions and the Christian life. Perhaps, it can stand as Luke's last word, too".

farewell-speech at the Last Supper (Luke 22,14-38) and Paul's at Miletus, especially between Jesus' challenge to the apostles to be like himself and to serve, with the promise that he will confer on them a kingdom, and Jesus' later saying cited by Paul, "It is more blessed to give than to receive", demonstrate that the saying is an integral part of the speech at Miletus and allow Luke to relate "giving" to the resurrection, one of his favorite themes in the speeches of Acts.

Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35 proves integral to the speech. Certainly, it describes Paul's use of what he earned. Moreover, once one realizes that Luke can speak of wealth and poverty metaphorically and that "giving" should be understood more broadly, Jesus' saying embraces God's message of grace which can give the elders inheritance among those sanctified and his obtaining of the church through the blood of his son, and Paul's placing no value on his own life but only desiring to complete the task and ministry he received from Christ. Vv. 18-23 flesh out Paul's attitude of giving during his ministry: he was always at the disposal of the elders, serving God with all humility, putting up with sorrow and trials and willing to accept future suffering, omitting none of the preaching that was beneficial to them, teaching them in public and private and bearing witness to everyone.

The contents of vv. 18-23 are basically repeated in vv. 25-27.31 which again actualize the giving of Jesus' saying. Paul's concern for everyone, his honest claim of not failing to proclaim to them the kingdom and the whole design of God and the length and intensity of his ministry all demonstrate the "giving" of Jesus' saying.

No one denies that the elders in the speech at Miletus are called to imitate Paul, and so Jesus' saying at the end of the speech well relates to their ministry. True, the elders are to be concerned for themselves; but then to watch out for the flock of which they are guardians and shepherds, to protect it from false teachers. The suggestion is that they are to imitate the generosity of God who obtained the Church with the blood of his own Son.

Finally a simple chiasmic structure was proposed (with Acts 20,17-18a as the introduction): summary of Paul's ministerial relationship with the Ephesian elders (vv. 18b-27), explicit paraenesis for the Ephesian elders (vv. 28-32) and return to Paul's ministry among the Ephesian elders (vv. 33-35). With this simple structure, Luke highlights not only Paul's ministry and his paraenesis to the Ephesians but Jesus' saying, "It is more blessed to



give than to receive". "Giving" characterizes God, Christ and Paul and should also mark the whole ministry of the elders, not only their willingness to share their financial gain with the socially poor. One might well say that Luke, by placing this saying of Jesus at the end of Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders, has anticipated the recent theological and spiritual concern of "faith and justice". Finally, for those pursuing the historical question, the terminology of Jesus' saying in Acts 20,35 is consonant with Luke's (and the other Synoptics') portrayal of Jesus' teaching.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
00187 Rome

Robert F. O'TOOLE, SJ

#### SOMMAIRE

Cet article étudie la parole de Jésus en Ac 20,35 ("Il y a plus de bonheur à donner qu'à recevoir"). Nous voudrions prouver que cette parole, qui ressemble aux béatitudes et est susceptible de nombreuses applications, fait partie intégrante du discours de Paul à Milet. Certains textes parallèles dans le reste de Luc-Actes, spécialement dans le récit de la Dernière Cène, renforcent l'importance de cette parole, car «donner» fait partie des thèmes chers à Luc. Le fait de donner caractérise Dieu en particulier, et il peut aussi expliquer l'usage que Paul a fait de ce qu'il a reçu comme salaire. Lorsqu'on s'est aperçu que Luc emploie le mot «richesse» au sens métaphorique, le verbe «donner» au v. 35 peut être compris dans un sens très large et peut décrire l'activité de Dieu ou du Christ, le ministère de Paul et celui des anciens, tels que nous les présente le discours de Milet. Luc, à l'aide d'une simple structure chiasique, met en lumière comment la parole de Jésus s'actualise dans le ministère et la parénèse de Paul.

## **Das "Ehescheidungsgesetz" von Dtn 24,1-4 nach altjüdischer Auslegung. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der neutestamentlichen Aussagen zur Ehescheidung (\*)**

Als Ausgangspunkt dieser Studie legen wir die Übersetzung von G. von Rad vor, die das in der modernen wissenschaftlichen Exegese übliche Verständnis des Textes widerspiegelt<sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Wenn ein Mann eine Frau nimmt und sie heiratet, wenn sie ihm dann aber nicht gefällt, weil er an ihr etwas Anstößiges gefunden hat, und er ihr einen Scheidebrief geschrieben, ihn ihr ausgehändigt und sie aus seinem Haus entlassen hat, <sup>2</sup>und wenn sie dann aus seinem Haus gegangen ist und ist hingegangen und eines anderen Mannes Weib geworden, — <sup>3</sup>und wenn dann der andere Mann sich auch von ihr abwendet, ihr einen Scheidebrief geschrieben, ihn ihr ausgehändigt und sie aus seinem Hause entlassen hat — oder der andere Mann, der sie genommen hat, ist gestorben — <sup>4</sup>so kann ihr erster Mann, der sie entlassen hat, sie nicht wieder nehmen, daß sie seine Frau wird, nachdem sie verunreinigt worden ist; denn das wäre ein Greuel vor Jahwe, und du sollst über das Land, das Jahwe, dein Gott, dir zum Erbbesitz geben wird, nicht Schuld bringen.

Aus der Übersetzung geht mit aller Deutlichkeit hervor, daß Dtn 24,1-4 einen eher außergewöhnlichen Rechtsfall behandelt und nicht ein eigentliches Ehescheidungsgesetz darstellt<sup>(2)</sup>; ein solches ist im gesamten Alten Testament nicht zu finden. In unserem Text wird

(\*) Der vorliegende Aufsatz ist aus langen Gesprächen mit meinem Kollegen Pierre Proulx erwachsen. Er beschäftigte sich hauptsächlich mit der neutestamentlichen Seite des Problems. Durch seine schwere Krankheit und seinen frühen Tod blieb eine gemeinsam in Aussicht genommene umfangreichere Publikation unvollendet. Pierre Proulx hinterließ jedoch zur "Ehescheidung" bei Matthäus Aufzeichnungen in französischer Sprache, hinter denen mehr seine als meine Arbeit steht und die vielleicht einmal von einem interessierten Kollegen aufgegriffen werden. Hier können nur einige Hinweise zu diesem Thema gegeben werden.

<sup>(1)</sup> *Das fünfte Buch Mose*. Deuteronomium (ATD 8; Göttingen 1964) 106-107.

<sup>(2)</sup> Vgl. G. VON RAD, *Das fünfte Buch*, 107-108.

in einer langen Reihe von Vordersätzen (Protasen) der Rechtsfall beschrieben; erst in 24,4 beginnt der Nachsatz (Apodosis) mit der Rechtsentscheidung und dessen Begründung. Die vorliegende Gesetzesnorm besagt: Wenn die in 24,1-3 genannten Voraussetzungen zutreffen, darf der Mann die von ihm geschiedene Frau nicht wieder heiraten. Was mit dem "Anstößigen" als Scheidungsgrund gemeint ist, wird nicht näher bestimmt, muß aber zur Zeit des Deuteronomiums allgemein bekannt gewesen sein. Der Tatsache, daß in einem Gesetzeswerk oft nur Sonder- und Grenzfälle behandelt werden und die Normalfälle als allgemein bekannt und als nicht erwähnensbedürftig unerörtert bleiben, begegnen wir z. B. auch im Codex Hammurapi<sup>(3)</sup>.

Die eben beschriebene Interpretation stellt aber nicht die gängige Auslegung des Textes zur Zeit des frühen Judentums dar. Schon die neutestamentliche Darstellung der Position der Pharisäer — "Es ist gesagt worden: Wer seine Frau entläßt, gebe ihr einen Scheidebrief" (Mt 5,31); "Wozu hat dann Mose vorgeschrieben, [der Frau] einen Scheidebrief zu geben und [sie] zu entlassen?" (Mt 19,7) — beweist, daß Dtn 24,1 auch als eigenständige Gesetzesnorm mit Protasis und Apodosis aufgefaßt wurde<sup>(4)</sup>. Auch die übrigen Verse sind,

(3) Vgl. H. P. H. PETSCHOW, "Die §§ 45 und 46 des Codex Hammurapi. Ein Beitrag zum altbabylonischen Bodenpachtrecht und zum Problem: Was ist der Codex Hammurapi?", *ZA* 74 (1984) 189-190.

(4) Auch einige moderne Übersetzungen vertreten diesen Standpunkt; s. auch unten S. 355 mit Anm. 8. Grundsätzlich gilt, daß in einem langen kasuistischen Gesetz, welches wie Dtn 24,1-4 mehrere mit *Waw* eingeleitete Verben enthält, das Problem entstehen kann, wo die Grenze zwischen der Protasis (bzw. den Protasen) und der Apodosis (bzw. den Apodosen) anzusetzen ist. Nach H. GESE, "Beobachtungen zum Stil alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze", *TLZ* 85 (1960) 147-150, der auf Dtn 24,1-4 nicht eingeht, besteht die einfachste Form des Konditionalsatzes in Rechtssätzen in der Zusammenfügung zweier oder mehrerer *Perfecta consecutiva*. Daneben kann die Protasis als *ki*- oder *'im*-Satz erscheinen. Eine zweite charakteristische Besonderheit der Form ist jedoch "bisher unbeachtet geblieben", daß es nämlich wegen der gleichen "'temporalen' Stilisierung" von Protasis und Apodosis unsicher sein kann, wo die Apodosis beginnt. Gese nennt dann verschiedene Kriterien für die Identifikation solcher Apodosen. K. BERGER, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu*. Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament I (WMANT 40/I; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1972) 514, stellt zunächst fest, daß das καὶ γράψει (MT: וכתב) von Dtn 24,1 LXX eine Zwischenbestimmung einfügt, und fährt fort: "Freilich kann man auch aus dem hebräischen Text ein eigenständiges Gebot herauslesen, wenn man die-

wie in diesem Aufsatz zu zeigen sein wird, in der zur Frage stehenden Zeit anders als heute verstanden worden. Was bewegte die jüdischen Schriftgelehrten, aus dem, was ursprünglich eine der Voraussetzungen eines speziellen Rechtsfalls war, eine eigenständige Gesetzesnorm zu machen? Wie ist es zu dieser und zu anderen Auslegungen von Dtn 24,1-4 gekommen?

Die jüdischen Schriftausleger, unter ihnen in erster Linie die Pharisäer/Rabbinen<sup>(5)</sup> mit ihrer Lehre von der "mündlichen Tora", waren überzeugt, Gott habe dem Mose eine vollkommene Lehre mitgeteilt, welche Antwort auf alle Fragen und Weisung für alle Lebenslagen enthielt. Die "schriftliche Tora" beinhaltete für sie sehr viel mehr, als was der naheliegende bzw. wörtliche Sinn (*Peshat*) einer Bibelstelle besagte. Durch eine aktualisierende, auf die jeweilige Situation bezogene Interpretation (*Derash, Midrash*) kam erst der tiefe, verborgene Reichtum eines Textes zum Vorschein. "Wende sie hin und wende sie her<sup>(6)</sup>", denn in ihr ist alles enthalten" (Mischna, Avot 5,22).

Bezüglich der Ehescheidung sahen sich die Pharisäer vor die Aufgabe gestellt, eine bindende Rechtsordnung zu schaffen und diese in der hebräischen Bibel zu verankern. Die einzige in Frage kommende Stelle (Dtn 24,1-4) betrifft aber nur einen eher eigenartigen Fall innerhalb dieser Institution. Doch begünstigten bzw. rechtfer-

---

sen Satz isoliert sieht...". Mehr allgemein zur *lectio duplex alternans* vgl. P. PROULX-J. O'CALLAGHAN, "La lectura del salmo 88,21b (LXX) en 1 Clem 18,1", *Bib* 61 (1980) 92-94.

(5) Was die viel diskutierte Definition der Pharisäer betrifft, so scheint uns die Position von E. RIVKIN am angemessensten; vgl. *A Hidden Revolution. The Pharisees' Search for the Kingdom Within* (Nashville 1978); "Scribes, Pharisees, Lawyers, Hypocrites: A Study in Synonymity", *HUCA* 49 (1978) 135-142. Nach Rivkin stimmen Josephus, das Neue Testament und die tannaitische Literatur in der Auffassung überein, daß die Pharisäer die autoritativen Übermittler der Überlieferung waren und daß ihre halachischen Lehren von der Mehrzahl der palästinischen Juden zur Zeit Jesu als normativ und bindend betrachtet wurden. Der Name "Pharisäer" geht auf die Sadduzäer zurück, welche die gegnerische Religionspartei abfällig als *perushim* ("Separatisten", "Häretiker") bezeichneten. Mit der Zerstörung des Tempels (70 n. Chr.) verloren die Sadduzäer ihre Machtstellung, und damit kam auch der Name "Pharisäer" außer Übung. Jetzt spricht man von anonymen Autoritäten, von den Schulen Hillels und Schammais und dann von individuellen Rabbinen.

(6) D. h.: durchforsche die Tora nach allen Seiten.

tigten die zahlreichen mit *Waw* eingeleiten Verben (*w<sup>e</sup>qatal*) das Vorgehen der Pharisäer, den Text aufzuteilen, ihn segmentiert zu lesen und überhaupt neu zu bearbeiten und so ein systematisches Ehescheidungsgesetz herzustellen. Neben der durchgehenden Lesung, die in dem Text von Dtn 24,1-4 eine einzige Gesetzesnorm findet, entsteht damit eine alternative Lesung: Der Text wird unterbrochen und dann unter entsprechender stillschweigender Wiederaufnahme des Gelesenen weitergeführt. Dies hat u. a. zur Folge, daß einige Aussagen einmal Teil des Falls, ein andermal Teil der Regelung sind; daß ferner mehr als nur *ein* Rechtssubjekt auftritt und daß die Begründung des Gesetzes nur seinen letzten Teil betrifft.

Im folgenden stellen wir eine Auswahl alter — verkürzter oder vollständiger — Lesungen von Dtn 24,1-4 vor, welche die verschiedenartigen Auffassungen von der syntaktischen Gliederung des Textes veranschaulichen. Unser besonderes Interesse gilt der gesetzlichen Materie des dtn Gesetzes und ihrer unterschiedlichen Interpretation bzw. Bearbeitung; auf die Begründungen von 24,4b werden wir nur am Rande eingehen. Die Übersetzungen bzw. Paraphrasen in griechischer Sprache sind am klarsten. Die scharfsinnigen und spitzfindigen Argumente der traditionellen rabbinischen Diskussionen erlauben es, die Hauptgliederungen der aus Dtn 24,1-4 gewonnenen Gesetzesnormen auch nach pharisäischem Verständnis zu rekonstruieren.

Das alles trägt dazu bei, den Hintergrund der neutestamentlichen Aussagen über die Ehescheidung zu erhellen. Wer aber das Neue Testament in seinem wahren zeitgeschichtlichen Rahmen sieht, kann auch umgekehrt argumentieren: Die neutestamentlichen Texte erweisen sich als brauchbare Interpretationshilfe zum Verständnis einiger zeitgenössischer Aussagen über die Ehescheidung. Vor allem erhält eine fast in Vergessenheit geratene, in dem vorliegenden Aufsatz der Schule Schammais zugeschriebene Position, über die rabbinischen Quellen hinaus, durch das Neue Testament (bes. Mt 5,32b) eine wichtige Stütze. Es geht bei dieser Position um das Verbot, eine wegen *ערוה דבר* geschiedene Frau zu heiraten. Die rabbinischen Texte und das Neue Testament beleuchten sich hier gegenseitig.

# I. Die Auslegung von Dtn 24,1-4 im hellenistischen Judentum

## 1. Übersetzung der LXX (als drei Rechtsabsätze gelesen, mit den zwei Männern als Rechtssubjekten) <sup>(7)</sup>

24,1: <sup>1</sup>Wenn einer eine Frau nimmt und mit ihr [ehelich] lebt, so soll es sein: Wenn sie kein Gefallen [mehr] vor ihm findet, weil er in ihr einen schändlichen Sachverhalt fand, so wird er ihr eine Trennungsurkunde schreiben und in ihre Hände geben und sie aus seinem Haus hinausschicken;

24,2-3a: <sup>2</sup>gehört sie dann, einmal weggegangen, einem zweiten Mann, <sup>3</sup>und haßt sie der letztere Mann, so wird er ihr eine Trennungsurkunde schreiben und in ihre Hände geben und sie aus seinem Haus hinausschicken;

24,3b-4: bzw. stirbt der letztere Mann, der sie sich zur Frau genommen hatte, <sup>4</sup>[so] wird der erste Mann, der sie hinausgeschickt hatte, nicht wiederkehren können, sie sich zur Frau zu nehmen, nachdem sie unrein gemacht worden ist, weil sie Greuel vor dem Herrn, deinem Gott, ist — so werdet ihr das Land, das der Herr, dein Gott, dir als Anteil gibt, nicht verunreinigen.

Diese Lesung des dtn Gesetzes ist an zwei Stellen unterbrochen. Der zweite und der dritte Absatz verlangen es jedoch, das jeweils Vorausgehende stillschweigend wiederaufzunehmen. An dieser Lesung wollen wir folgende Punkte unterstreichen:

<sup>(7)</sup> Mit BERGER, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 512-514, halten wir den Wechsel zwischen Ind. Fut. und Konj. Aor., wie er in der LXX-Lesung vorliegt, für entscheidend. Im ersten Fall handelt es sich um Verben von Hauptsätzen, welche die Regelung der Rechtsfälle ausdrücken, im zweiten Fall um Verben der Konditionalsätze. Nach den besten Handschriften bestimmt dieser Wechsel Inhalt und Abgrenzung der jeweiligen Protasen und Apodosen. Einige abweichende Lesarten scheinen allerdings die korrelativen Grenzen zu verschieben, so in 24,1: συνοικήση/σει und γράψει/η; in 24,3: μισήση/σει und γράψει/η. Diese Varianten, die relativ schlecht bezeugt sind, wird man als auf Homophonie beruhende Verwechslung des Modus betrachten müssen; vgl. J. W. WEVERS, *Deuteronomium* (Septuaginta; Göttingen 1977) 389-390.

Ein anderes Beispiel für eine mit Dtn 24,1-4 verwandte LXX-Lektüre stellt Dtn 22,13ff. dar (vgl. BERGER, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 514). Zu unserer Reihe der auf die drei Abschnitte verteilten Konditionalsätze, die alle von einer einzigen Konjunktion abhängen, und zu den Auslassungen gemeinsamer Satzteile vgl. K. BEYER, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament* I,1 (SUNT; Göttingen 1962) 96-97. Einige Textzeugen haben allerdings εἰ oder ἐάν am Anfang von 24,2 eingefügt.

1. In der LXX kommt die Selbständigkeit von 24,1 als kasuistische Gesetzesnorm klar und deutlich zum Ausdruck. Die *Vetus Latina* übernimmt diese Abgrenzung 24,1, wie es das Zitat des Tertullian (*Adversus Marcionem* 4,34,1) bezeugt, und die *Vulgata* des Hieronymus übermittelt sie an die christliche Exegese des Abendlands<sup>(8)</sup>.

2. Die singuläre Trennung 24,3a/3b läßt die Parallelität zwischen den ersten beiden Absätzen deutlich in Erscheinung treten. Trotz Verkürzung und Variation in der Beschreibung des zweiten Rechtsfalls handelt es sich wesentlich um dieselbe gesetzliche Materie, die durch dieselbe Gesetzesnorm geregelt wird.

3. Aufgrund der singulären Trennung beginnt der dritte Absatz abrupt mit einer alternativen Protasis ("bzw.": ἤ; v. l. καί) und erfordert eine entsprechende stillschweigende Wiederaufnahme des Vorausgehenden. Am Anfang dieses Absatzes muß nicht nur der ganze unmittelbar vorausgehende Absatz (24,2-3a) mit 24,3a als dem ersten Glied der Alternative als zusätzliche Protasis wiederaufgenommen werden; wiederaufgenommen wird auch der erste Absatz (24,1), und zwar als weitere Protasis und als Voraussetzung für

<sup>(8)</sup> *Adv. Marc.* 4,34,1 (CCL 1,635): Si sumserit quis uxorem et habitaverit cum ea, et evenierit non invenire eam apud eum gratiam, eo quod inventum sit in illa impudicum negotium, scribet libellum repudii et dabit in manu eius et dimittet illam de domo sua. Dtn 24,1ff. Vg: <sup>1</sup>Si acceperit homo uxorem et habuerit eam, et non invenerit gratiam ante oculos eius propter aliquam foeditatem, scribet libellum repudii et dabit in manu illius et dimittet eam de domo sua. <sup>2</sup>Cumque egressa alterum maritum duxerit, <sup>3</sup>et ille quoque oderit eam dederitque ei libellum repudii...

Die syntaktische Gliederung von 24,2-3 ist dagegen in der Tradition weniger präzise festgelegt, wie auch die singuläre Zäsur 24,3a/3b der LXX zeigt. Die Paraphrase Philos läßt erkennen, daß bereits seit der ersten Hälfte des 1. Jh. n. Chr. die Einteilung vorliegt, die dem modernen wissenschaftlichen Verständnis entspricht, mit der Angabe des alternativen Umstands ("bei Lebzeiten oder sogar nach Tod") in 24,3. Josephus, der in diesen zwei Versen sehr frei interpretiert, setzt seine einzige stärkere Zäsur in 24,2/3 an und teilt somit die ursprüngliche gesetzliche Materie in zwei Abschnitte ein; 24,3 dient als alternative Protasis. In der unten vorgelegten Rekonstruktion, in der wir die gegensätzlichen Lesungen von Bet-Hillel und Bet-Schammai nebeneinanderstellen, sind die syntaktische Gliederung von 24,2-3 sowie die logische Verbindung der beiden Verse mit dem unmittelbaren Kontext für das allgemeine Verständnis des Gesetzes von entscheidender Bedeutung. In diesen beiden Versen findet sich unseres Erachtens auch der Schlüssel und der Kernpunkt für die Verwendung der gesetzlichen Materie in dem Logion des Matthäus.

24,2-3a. All dies wird diesmal durch die Apodosis 24,4a gesetzlich geregelt. In zwei rückläufigen Schritten wird also die Einheit des Gesetzes, das uns die LXX in drei Normen zergliedert vorlegt, wiederum sichtbar.

4. Ferner ist zu beachten: Der Grund für die Trennung (ערות דבר) wird in der LXX auf der Ebene eines schändlichen und unziemlichen Verhaltens (ἄσχημον πρᾶγμα) gesehen.

5. Zwei der drei für das Verbot von 24,4 genannten Begründungen, nämlich Verunreinigung der Frau (μιανθῆναι) und Befleckung des Landes (μιανεῖτε), sind unter dem einen Begriff der Unreinheit zusammengefügt und weisen in die gleiche Richtung wie Jer 3,1, wo Land und Frau in derselben Entweihung metaphorisch vereinigt sind.

## 2. Dtn 24,1-4 bei Philo: SpecLeg III 30-31 (als ein Abschnitt gelesen, mit der Frau als Rechtssubjekt)

Philo macht sich in seiner Paraphrase des Gesetzes die syntaktische Gliederung zu eigen, die uns von der modernen wissenschaftlichen Exegese her vertraut ist. Wir haben eine durchgehende Lesung eines einheitlichen Gesetzes vor uns:

<sup>1</sup>Wenn eine Frau, die aus irgendeinem Grund (°) vom Mann getrennt [wurde], <sup>2</sup>[dann] mit einem anderen eine Ehe eingeht, <sup>3</sup>sich wieder ohne Mann findet — bei Lebzeiten oder sogar nach dem Tod des zweiten —, <sup>4</sup>so darf sie zum früheren Mann nicht zurückgehen.

(°) Der Scheidungsgrund, der hier durch das Wort πρόφασις bezeichnet ist, wird in SpecLeg III 80-82 weiter verdeutlicht. Dort kommentiert Philo die im nachhinein erhobene Anklage eines Mannes wegen fehlender Jungfräulichkeit seiner angetrauten Frau (Dtn 22,13-21): "Wenn solche [Männer] einen Bruch des Ehebandes (διᾶζεσθαι) durchzusetzen suchen, aber keinen tatsächlichen Trennungsgrund (ἀπαλλαγῆς πρόφασιν) finden, sich daher auf Verleumdungen verlassen und dabei in Ermangelung offenkundiger Klageansprüche ihre Anschuldigungen auf Verborgenes richten...". Weiter schreibt Philo: Wenn die Unschuld der Angeklagten bewiesen werden kann, "sollen die Richter gegen die, welche falsche Anklage ersonnen haben, auf eine Geldstrafe... erkennen". Aus diesen Texten geht hervor, daß das Wort πρόφασις im Gegensatz zu Verleumdung und falscher Anklage steht und das Offenliegende, nicht das Verborgene, betrifft (vgl. F. ROBERT, "Prophasis", REG 89 [1976] 317-342). Mit anderen Worten: ערות דבר wird in der obigen Paraphrase im weiten Sinn (καθ' ἣν ἂν τύχη), jedoch mit Berufung auf Tatsachen (πρόφασιν) ausgelegt.



Man stellt zunächst fest, daß die Materie der ersten drei Verse des dtn Gesetzes, welche die aufeinanderfolgenden Stufen des Falls — Scheidung, Wiederheirat, Verlust des zweiten Mannes — umreißen, vom Standpunkt der Frau aus betrachtet wird; die Rolle des ersten Mannes wird aber in der im Anschluß an die zitierte Stelle behandelten Angelegenheit der Aussöhnung breit beschrieben. Sodann fällt auf, daß neben dem Scheidebrief (Dtn 24,1) auch die Schlußbegründungen des Gesetzes (24,4b) unerwähnt bleiben. Dagegen erweitert Philo im Anschluß an den zitierten Text, immer noch das Gesetz paraphrasierend<sup>(10)</sup>, in drei Punkten: eventuelle dritte Heirat der verstoßenen Frau; scharfer Tadel, den sich der erste Ehemann im Fall einer Aussöhnung mit ihr (καταλλαγή) nach ihrer zweiten Heirat zuziehen würde; Bestrafung der beiden ersten Ehepartner mit dem Tod im Fall der Aussöhnung<sup>(11)</sup>.

Die ersten beiden dieser Punkte lassen uns Philos Verständnis des Gesetzes besser begreifen: Eine dritte Heirat ist in Erwägung gezogen; die Aussöhnung mit dem ersten Mann wird aber auf das schärfste verworfen, weil diese Frau bereits die altehrwürdigen Satzungen (θεσμοὶ ἀρχαῖοι) vergessen und übertreten hat, indem sie — anläßlich der zweiten Heirat<sup>(12)</sup> — neue Reize der Liebe den alten vorzog. Würden sich aber die beiden ersten Ehepartner nach der zweiten Heirat der Frau aussöhnen, so bewiese dies nicht nur, daß es dem Ehemann an Abscheu gegen das Böse fehlt, sondern jetzt würde vor allem klar, daß er sich — anläßlich der früheren Scheidung<sup>(13)</sup> — des

<sup>(10)</sup> Dtn 24,4a: Unreinheit der Frau; Frau und erster Mann als Gegenstand des göttlichen Greuels (*Qerê/Ketib*: תועבה הוא/היא, auch im Griechischen zweideutig: βδέλυγμά ἐστιν).

<sup>(11)</sup> Die theoretischen wie praktischen Rechtsquellen, die diesen freien und wohl abstrakten Kommentar Philos beeinflußt haben, sind uns unbekannt.

<sup>(12)</sup> Im Gegensatz zu dieser Erklärung kann nach I. HEINEMANN, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung* (Breslau 1932) 317-318, der Vorwurf der "Übertretung der alten Ehesatzung" nur meinen, "daß die Frau schon durch den Gedanken an die Verbindung mit einem anderen Mann gegen den Sinn des Eheversprechens verstoßen hat". K. BERGER, *Gesetzesauslegung*, macht, was die Beurteilung von Ehescheidung und Wiederheirat betrifft, keinen Unterschied und schreibt einmal: "Ehescheidung wird also in jedem Falle negativ qualifiziert als Übertretung der ehelichen 'Gesetze' und Gelöbnisse..." (519), und dann: "eine Wiederheirat nach Scheidung (ist) weitgehend dem Ehebruch gleichgestellt als eine Übertretung der Satzungen über die Ehe" (520).

<sup>(13)</sup> Was diese Erklärung betrifft, so gibt das in der vorausgehenden

Ehebruchs (μοιχεία) und der Kuppelei schuldig gemacht hat. Diese Aussagen wollen wir etwas präzisieren:

1. Das Eingehen der zweiten Verbindung, für das die Frau die Verantwortung zu tragen hat, läßt eine einseitige Trennung zu einer vollkommenen und unwiderruflichen Ehescheidung werden. Der vollständige Bruch wird somit als durch beide Seiten zustandekommend aufgefaßt. Man beachte also die Doppelausdrücke, mit welchen die zwei Momente einer Ehescheidung bezeichnet werden: 1) Die obige Paraphrase verwendet ἀπαλλάττεσθαι ([vom ersten Mann] getrennt werden + γαμεῖσθαι ([mit einem anderen] eine Ehe eingehen). Dieses Begriffspaar erinnert an das Prinzip des *contrarius actus* der römischen Ehescheidung (*diffarreatio* – *confarreatio*) oder an die Unterscheidung zwischen *repudium* und *verum divortium* (zuerst mündliche oder schriftliche Erklärung des Scheidungswillens, dann tatsächliche Aufhebung der Lebensgemeinschaft). 2) Die in Anm. 9 zitierte Stelle *SpecLeg* III 80 verwendet ἀπαλλαγή (“Trennung”) und διάζευξις (“Bruch des [Ehe]bandes”) zur Bezeichnung der beiden Momente der Ehescheidung. In zwei anderen Texten treten die beiden Komponenten noch präziser in Erscheinung: *Cher* 2-3.10 (ἀποστέλλειν – ἐκβάλλειν) und vor allem *Det* 149: “Die Seele, die des Guten enthoben (χηρεῦουσα), aber doch nicht ausgestoßen ist (μήπω δὲ ἐκβεβλημένη), kann das Einverständnis und die Versöhnung (συμβάσεις καὶ καταλλαγὰς) mit dem richtigen Wort, ihrem rechtmäßigen Gatten, wiederfinden. Die aber einmal vom Eheband gelöst und aus dem Haus vertrieben wurde (διαζευχθεῖσα καὶ διοικισθεῖσα), ist... bis in alle Ewigkeit verjagt, ohne in das alte Haus zurückkehren zu können”<sup>(14)</sup>. Auch ein anonymer lateini-

---

Anmerkung angeführte Zitat die Auffassung Bergers zur Frage wieder. Als Begründung dient ihm die Feststellung, daß nach Philo die Ausstellung des Scheidebriefs “bloße Formalität” sei (520). Nach I. HEINEMANN, “Jüdisch-hellenistische Gerichtshöfe in Alexandrien?”, *MGWJ* 74 (1930) 364, setzt Philo voraus, “daß sich die Frau durch das zeitweise Zusammenleben mit ihrem Liebhaber, trotz dessen formaler Bemäntelung durch den Scheidebrief, des Ehebruchs, der Mann der Kuppelei schuldig gemacht hat”. An anderer Stelle schreibt HEINEMANN: “Des Ehebruchs macht sich dieser Mann nur dann schuldig, wenn der zweite Mann noch lebt; das Vergehen der Kuppelei begeht er durch die Unterstützung der ehebrecherischen Pläne seiner Frau” (*Philons Bildung*, 319).

<sup>(14)</sup> Zu bemerken ist, daß Philos διαζευγνύναι für ἐκβάλλειν stehen kann (*Det* 149; *SpecLeg* II 25; III 64) und daß es das ἐξαποστέλλειν der

scher Matthäus-Kommentar, das zu Beginn des 5. Jh. verfaßte *Opus imperfectum*, unterscheidet klar nach Art des römischen Rechts die beiden Momente der Scheidung: "Matrimonium enim non facit coitus, sed voluntas: et ideo illud non solvit separatio corporis, sed separatio voluntatis. Ideo qui dimittit conjugem suam, et aliam non accipit, adhuc maritus est. Nam etsi corpore jam separatus est, tamen adhuc voluntate conjunctus est. Cum ergo aliam acceperit, tunc plene dimittit" (PG 56,802).

2. Die zweite Heirat macht die ursprünglich beabsichtigte Polarität von Trennung/Versöhnung (ἀπαλλαγή/καταλλαγή) zunichte. Diese Polarität tritt durch die Behandlung der Versöhnung und ihrer Ablehnung in einem gegebenen Fall scharf in den Vordergrund. An sich ist die Trennung vorläufig und widerruflich und zielt auf Aussöhnung.

3. Falls es nach der zweiten Heirat zu einer Aussöhnung käme, würde dies im nachhinein auch die Schuld des Ehemannes bei der Trennung selbst beweisen: diese Trennung, die nunmehr als heuchlerisch und ungültig zu bezeichnen ist, hat den ersten Mann direkt oder indirekt (προαγωγεία) für den Ehebruch seiner Frau mit dem vermeintlichen zweiten Ehemann verantwortlich gemacht<sup>(15)</sup>.

4. Die altehrwürdigen Satzungen (θεσμοὶ ἀρχαῖοι) werden im allgemeinen mit den Satzungen über die Ehe (οἱ ἐπὶ γάμοις θεσμοί) von *SpecLeg* III 61.63 identifiziert<sup>(16)</sup> oder auf die mit der Ehe — in unserem Fall der ersten Ehe — eingegangenen rechtmäßigen Ver-

---

LXX (Dtn 22,29) verbessernd ersetzt (*SpecLeg* III 70; vgl. Dtn 22,19 und *SpecLeg* III 82); in *SpecLeg* III 64 und III 70 ist die διάζευξις mit der endgültigen Trennung, die durch den Tod erfolgt, in Verbindung gebracht (vgl. auch *Abr* 258; *Migr* 7).

Ähnliche einander entgegengesetzte Doppelausdrücke finden sich in Mur 115 (Wiederheiratsurkunde, 124 n. Chr.): ἀπαλλαγήναι + ἀπολύειν – καταλλάξαι + προσλάβεσθαι. An anderen Stellen stehen sich diese Verben je einzeln gegenüber und tragen so dazu bei, die Komponenten der Doppelausdrücke semantisch näher zu bestimmen: ἀπαλλαγή–καταλλαγή (Philo; P. Oxy. [96 v. Chr.], 25-27); χωρισθῆναι–καταλλαγήναι (1 Kor 7,10-11); χωρισθῆναι–κατηντηκέναι (BGU 1101 [13 v. Chr.], 5-6); διάζευξις–καταλλαγή (Josephus, *Ant* XI 195); ἐκπηδᾶν–καταλλάττειν (BGU 1463 [247/6 v. Chr.], 2-3).

<sup>(15)</sup> Diese beiden Verbrechen, *adulterium* der Frau und *lenocinium* des Mannes, stehen auch in den Kommentaren der "lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis" (18 v. Chr.) in gegenseitiger Verbindung; vgl. vor allem *Dig.* 48,5: 40/41,1; 29/30,3; 8/9.

<sup>(16)</sup> Vgl. BERGER, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 519.

pflichtungen bezogen. Doch könnte der Ausdruck unseres Erachtens ebenso gut mit dem (νόμος πατριος καὶ) θεσμός ἀρχαῖος von *SpecLeg* II 13 in Beziehung stehen. Auf alle Fälle muß ἀρχαῖος von παλαιός, das hier sogar die alten Reize der Liebe (vgl. auch *Virt* 115), d. h. die erste Ehe der Frau, bezeichnet, unterschieden werden. Als Objekt eines Vergessens, welches für den "sündhaften" Zustand des Menschen in der griechischen und biblischen Kultur kennzeichnend ist, dürften diese altehrwürdigen Satzungen vielmehr auf das Gesetz des "Anfangs", von dem auch Mt 19,4-8 und die Parallele Mk 10,6-9 sprechen, verweisen.

3. *Dtn 24,1-4 bei Josephus: Ant IV 253* (als zwei Rechtsabsätze gelesen, mit dem Mann bzw. der Frau als Rechtssubjekten)

Die Paraphrase teilt diesmal das dtn Gesetz in zwei Rechtsabsätze ein, wobei der zweite den gesamten ersten wiederaufnimmt, und zwar, was die Form betrifft, als stillschweigende *lectio duplex alternans* und, was den Inhalt betrifft, als Voraussetzung für die neue Protasis. So haben wir eine unterbrochene, aber keine abgebrochene Lesung von 24,1-4 vor uns, welche zwei kasuistische Gesetzesnormen enthält.

24,1-2: <sup>1</sup>Derjenige, der sich bei irgendwelcher Veranlassung — unter Menschen können viele solche vorkommen — entscheidet, sich von der Frau, die mit ihm [ehelich] lebt, [voll] zu scheiden (<sup>17</sup>), soll schriftlich bestätigen, daß er nie mehr mit ihr verkehren wird; <sup>2</sup>so wird sie nämlich das Recht erhalten, mit einem anderen [ehelich] zu leben, was vorher gewiß nicht zu gestatten ist;

24,3-4a: [in diesem Fall] aber, <sup>3</sup>selbst wenn (<sup>18</sup>) sie von jenem schlecht behandelt worden ist bzw. (<sup>19</sup>) nach dessen Tod, <sup>4</sup>ist es ihr, selbst wenn der erste sie [wieder] zu heiraten wünscht, nicht erlaubt zurückzukehren.

(<sup>17</sup>) διαζευθῆναι + Genitiv.

(<sup>18</sup>) εἰ δὲ καί; gängige Übersetzung: "Wenn sie aber *auch* von jenem schlecht behandelt wurde und/oder...". Diese Interpretation von καί ermöglicht eine dem dtn Gesetz syntaktisch näherstehende Lesung; jedoch ist die damit hergestellte Gleichsetzung der beiden Männer hinsichtlich des schlechten Behandelns ungerechtfertigt, obwohl Dtn 24,3 Vg mit "et ille quoque" beginnt. Man kann auch nicht das κακοῦσθαι πρὸς im Sinn von "verstoßen werden von" deuten, obwohl in griechischen Eheverträgen aus Ägypten den Männern die Verpflichtung auferlegt wird, ihre Frauen nicht schlecht zu behandeln, κακοῦεῖν (vgl. z. B. P. Tebt. 104 [92 v. Chr.] 22; BGU 1052 [13 v. Chr.] 15). Dagegen ist der konzessive Gebrauch von εἰ καί bei Josephus gut bezeugt, obwohl selten zu Beginn eines Satzes (vgl. *Ant* IV 66; V 31 usw.).

(<sup>19</sup>) καί; v. 1. ἤ.

Die Paraphrase des Josephus bringt einige wichtige Änderungen der Gesamtstruktur des dtn Gesetzes mit sich: 1) 24,2, das ganz aus dem kasuistischen Stil fällt, wird zu einem Korollar des Gesetzes von 24,1 und dient dazu, den Scheidebrief vom Standpunkt der Frau aus rechtlich zu bestimmen. 2) 24,3, das sehr verkürzt wiedergegeben wird und die zweite Scheidung unerwähnt läßt, tritt in Form zweier sich zuspitzender Konzessivsätze auf; sie dienen dazu, in einem präzisen Fall die dem Scheidebrief eigene unwiderrufliche Kraft hervorzuheben. 3) Bei dem, was weggelassen wird, sind besonders die drei Begründungen von 24,4 zu nennen.

Was ist nun die zentrale Aussage der Paraphrase? Josephus, der offenbar dem Leser<sup>(20)</sup> eine ganz bestimmte Vorstellung vom jüdischen Scheidebrief vermitteln will, legt Wert auf die symmetrische Verteilung von Rechten und Pflichten, die er in zwei Gesetzesnormen mit je eigenem Rechtssubjekt darlegt: Dem freien Recht des Mannes auf Scheidung und seiner Pflicht, nie mehr mit der Geschiedenen zu verkehren, entspricht auf seiten der Frau die Pflicht, nie mehr zu ihm zurückzukehren, und das Recht auf Heirat mit einem anderen Mann. Damit ist auch erklärt, warum sich die Frau entgegengesetzten späteren Wünschen, die von ihr oder dem Mann ausgehen mögen, widersetzen muß. Ein solcher Begriff einer einseitigen und zugleich vollständigen Scheidung, die, wenn wir Josephus richtig interpretieren, als unwiderruflich, d. h. zum vollständigen und endgültigen Bruch des Ehebandes als notwendig und hinreichend aufgefaßt wird, übertrifft an juristischer Härte das Scheidungsrecht der Schule Hillels, mit der Josephus sonst in der Aufgliederung des dtn Gesetzes und in der weiten Auffassung vom Scheidungsgrund übereinstimmt.

Mit der beschriebenen Auffassung vom Scheidebrief werden die Begründungen von Dtn 24,4 sekundär und bleiben bei Josephus unerwähnt<sup>(21)</sup>. Wir haben es in diesem Abschnitt offensichtlich mit einer Lobrede auf die Rechtskraft des jüdischen Scheidebriefs zu tun.

<sup>(20)</sup> *Ant* wendet sich an "die ganze griechisch sprechende Welt" (I 5), in erster Linie also an einen nichtjüdischen Leserkreis; vgl. P. BILDE, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome* (JSPSS 2; Sheffield 1988) 102-103.

<sup>(21)</sup> In dem gesamten Sonderkapitel über die biblischen Ehegesetze (*Ant* IV 244-259) zeigt sich die Tendenz, die Dinge von der religiösen und kultischen Ebene auf die Ebene der Vernunft, im besonderen des Tatbestands, des Rechts, der Bräuche und der Psychologie zu übertragen.

## II. Die Auslegung von Dtn 24,1-4 im früh rabbinischen Judentum

### 1. Zur Diskussion um Dtn 24,1-4 in den Schulen Hillels und Schammais

In diesem Abschnitt legen wir die einschlägigen Texte vor, welche die Kontroverse zwischen Bet-Hillel und Bet-Schammai wiedergeben. Ausgangspunkt sind die folgenden klassischen Quellen, die in ihrem Kern in die Zeit vor 70 n. Chr. zu datieren sind: Mischna Giṭṭin 9,10, die Baraita<sup>(22)</sup> im Traktat Giṭṭin des babylonischen Talmuds (bGit 90a) und ihre Parallele in Sifre Dtn § 269.

(I) Einleitung: *Mischna Giṭṭin 9,10*, hier übersetzt nach der Version von *SifDtn 269*

Bet-Schammai sagt: [A] Der Mann darf seine Frau nur dann verstoßen, wenn<sup>(23)</sup> er an ihr ערוה<sup>(24)</sup> gefunden hat; denn es heißt: "... weil er an ihr ערוה דבר gefunden hat" (24,1b).

Bet-Hillel aber sagt: [B] [Er darf es,] auch wenn sie seine Speise anbrennen ließ; denn es heißt: דבר (24,1b).

Rabbi Akiba sagt: [C] Auch wenn er eine andere, schöner als sie, gefunden hat; denn es heißt: "Es wird so sein, wenn sie keine Gunst in seinen Augen findet..." (24,1b).

### (II) Baraita

*bGit 90aBar.:*

Bet-Hillel sprach zu Bet-Schammai:  
Heißt es denn (in 24,1) nicht gerade  
לא דבר?!

*SifDtn 269:*

Bet-Hillel sprach zu Bet-Schammai:  
Wenn es (in 24,1)  
דבר heißt,  
warum heißt es [auch noch] ערוה?

<sup>(22)</sup> Bezeichnung einer nicht in die Mischna aufgenommenen Lehre der Tannaiten, d. h. der Gesetzeslehrer, die von der Zeit Hillels und Schammais bis zur Endredaktion der Mischna (ca. 200 n. Chr.) wirkten.

<sup>(23)</sup> לא יגרש... אלא אם כן.

<sup>(24)</sup> Zu beachten ist die allerdings nicht von allen Handschriften bestätigte Reduzierung von ערוה דבר auf ערוה in der Exegese Bet-Schammais. Auch einige Mischna-Handschriften (Cambridge, Kaufmann u. a.) lesen ebenfalls nur ערוה. Die traditionellen Ausgaben der Mischna bringen eigenartigerweise die Umstellung דבר ערוה, die gerade auch wegen der Wortfolge an das sehr umstrittene λόγος πορνείας von Mt 5,32 erinnert. Das aus dem ursprünglichen Syntagma reduzierte ערוה kann dagegen mit μη ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ von Mt 19,9 verglichen werden.

Bet-Schammai erwiderte ihnen:

Heißt es denn (in 24,1) nicht gerade  
[ערוה]?

Bet-Hillel sprach zu ihnen: Wenn es  
[zur Bezeichnung des rechtmäßigen  
Grundes] [ערוה] hieße und nicht  
[auch] [דבר] hieße, würde ich [mit  
euch] sagen: [D] Wegen Blöße  
(ערוה) gehe sie fort (cf. 24,1-2a),  
wegen [sonst] etwas (דבר) gehe sie  
nicht fort. Daher heißt es  
[auch] [דבר].

Und wenn es [zur Bezeichnung  
des rechtmäßigen Grundes] [דבר] hieße  
und nicht [auch] [ערוה] hieße, würde  
ich

(erstens) [gerade so wie wir] sagen:

[E] [Die] wegen [דבר] [fortgeht],

[darf] von einem anderen geheiratet  
werden (cf. 24,1-2);

(zweitens) aber [gegen uns und mit  
euch]: [F] [Die] wegen [ערוה]

[fortgeht,] [darf] nicht von einem  
anderen geheiratet werden  
(cf. 24,1-3).

Daher heißt es [auch]

[ערוה].

Und wenn es (in 24,1)

[ערוה] heißt,

warum heißt es [auch noch] [דבר] ?

Wenn es nämlich [zur Bezeichnung  
des rechtmäßigen Grundes] [דבר] hieße  
und nicht [auch] [ערוה] hieße, würde  
ich

(erstens) [gerade so wie wir] sagen:

[E] Diejenige, die wegen [דבר] fort-  
geht (24,1-2a),

darf [wieder] geheiratet werden  
(cf. 24,2b);

(zweitens) [gegen uns und mit euch]:

[F] Diejenige aber, die wegen [ערוה]  
fortgeht (24,1-2a), darf nicht [wie-  
der] geheiratet werden (cf. 24,2b-3).

Und wundere dich nicht [über diese  
Meinung]: Wenn sie [aufgrund von  
[ערוה] demjenigen (nämlich ihrem  
Mann) verboten ist, der [allein ihr  
bis dahin] erlaubt war, sollte sie  
dann [nach Scheidung aufgrund  
von [ערוה] nicht [erst recht] demjeni-  
gen (nämlich jedem fremden Mann)  
verboten sein, der ihr [bis dahin]  
verboten war?!

[Dagegen aber] lehrt die Schrift:  
"ערוה... und ist sie aus seinem  
Haus gezogen und hingegangen  
[,um einem anderen Mann zu ge-  
hören], so gehöre sie [als Gattin]  
einem anderen Mann" (24,1-2).

Und wenn es [zur Bezeichnung des  
rechtmäßigen Grundes] [ערוה] hieße  
und nicht [auch] [דבר] hieße, würde  
ich [mit Bet-Schammai] sagen:

[D] Wegen ערה gehe sie fort (cf. 24,1-2a), wegen דבר gehe sie nicht fort. [Dagegen aber] lehrt die Schrift: “דבר... und sie wird aus seinem Haus ziehen” (24,1-2a).

### (III) Zusatz zur Baraita in *bGit 90a*:

Und was macht Bet-Schammai mit diesem דבר? Es heißt hier (24,1) דבר und es heißt dort (Dtn 19,15) דבר: “Durch zwei Zeugen oder durch drei Zeugen wird etwas (דבר) bestätigt”. Wie [es sich] dort [um Bestätigung] durch zwei Zeugen [handelt], so [handelt es sich] hier [um Bestätigung] durch zwei Zeugen.

Dazu Bet-Hillel: Steht denn [zur Begründung eurer Auffassung] geschrieben: [G] ערה בדבר (Blöße mit Bezeugung)?!

Dazu Bet-Schammai: Steht denn [zur Begründung eurer Auffassung] geschrieben: [H] או ערה או דבר (entweder Blöße oder irgend etwas)?!

Dazu Bet-Hillel: Deshalb steht geschrieben: [J] ערות דבר, weil darunter das eine (או ערה או דבר)<sup>(25)</sup> und das andere (ערה בדבר)<sup>(26)</sup> zu verstehen ist.

### *Bemerkungen und Kommentar*

1. Die oben übersetzten Texte bieten dem aufmerksamen Leser einen Einblick in die halachische Kontroverse zwischen Bet-Hillel und Bet-Schammai bezüglich der Lehre von der Ehescheidung, ihrer biblischen Grundlage und der damit verbundenen hermeneutischen Fragen<sup>(27)</sup>. Behandelt werden die rechtlichen Gründe für die Verstoßung der Frau und die Wiederheirat dieser Frau. Die entscheidenden Argumente, in welche Richtung sie auch weisen, leiten sich ausschließlich vom dtn Gesetz her, einem Gesetz, das aber auf syntaktischer Ebene von den beiden Schulen verschieden verstanden bzw. verwendet wurde.

<sup>(25)</sup> Es gibt zwei Scheidungsgründe: entweder ערה oder דבר.

<sup>(26)</sup> Bei der pflichtmäßigen Scheidung wegen ערה ist das Zeugnis von zwei Zeugen erforderlich. Vgl. Rashi z. St.; ebenso A. STEINSALTZ z. St. (Ausgabe des bab. Talmuds, Traktat Giṭṭin [1993]).

<sup>(27)</sup> Was die Interpretation dieser und anderer im folgenden zitierter rabbinischer Texte betrifft, so hoffen wir, auch einen Beitrag zur Lösung einiger noch umstrittener Fragen zu leisten. M.S. FELDBLUM, פירושים, מחקרים בחלמוד. מסכת גיטין (New York 1966) 221-223, hat einige der Probleme angesprochen und darauf zu antworten versucht; seinen Vorschlägen können wir allerdings nicht immer zustimmen.



Die obigen Quellen der Kontroverse werden als authentisch angesehen. Unter Anwendung der Formanalyse gelangt J. Neusner zu dem folgenden, differenzierteren Urteil<sup>(28)</sup>: a) Nur die Einleitung — A und B nach unserem Schema — gehört in ihrer jetzigen Dialogform ("colloquy") zu den alten Traditionen der Schulen Hillels und Schammais; R. Akiba liefert den *terminus ante quem*. A gibt die Halacha von Bet-Schammai mit ihrer soliden Exegese des Wortsinns wieder. b) Die Baraita (II), die in zwei parallelen Quellen vorliegt, geht auf hillelitische Kreise zurück; bei dem hier vorliegenden Dialog handelt es sich um Fiktion. Auswahl und Organisation des Stoffes sind einseitig und polemisch ausgerichtet: die Exegese Bet-Schammais wird unterdrückt, der Standpunkt Bet-Hillels, dem klar der Vorzug gegeben ist, wird dagegen breit dargelegt. Neusner zitiert nicht den Zusatz zur Baraita in bGit 90a (III).

In fast gänzlicher Übereinstimmung mit Neusners Beobachtungen<sup>(29)</sup> halten wir an folgenden Punkten, die sich für unseren Kommentar als nützlich erweisen werden, fest: Die Einleitung (I), die unbestrittene Glaubwürdigkeit besitzt, bleibt das entscheidende Kriterium, mit dem die übrigen Aussagen über die Halacha Bet-Schammais zu messen sind; in der Antwort Bet-Hillels gemäß der Baraita (II) ist notwendigerweise etwas über den nahezu in Vergessenheit geratenen gegnerischen Standpunkt mitgesagt; auch der Zusatz zur Baraita (III) trägt zur Klärung der beiden Positionen bei.

2. Was die historische Entwicklung der Halacha über die Verstoßungsgründe betrifft, so entspricht die Reihenfolge der Mischna (I) — Schammai, Hillel, R. Akiba — dem geschichtlichen Prozeß, den man für einige andere Halachot fast allgemein annimmt<sup>(30)</sup>.

(28) J. NEUSNER, *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70*, II (Leiden 1971) 37-39.

(29) Der Vermutung FELDBLUMS, פירושים, 222, in SifDtn werde aus der Sicht Bet-Schammais und in bGit aus der Sicht Bet-Hillels argumentiert, können wir uns nicht anschließen. Feldblum bevorzugt die Version von SifDtn und läßt ferner wie Neusner den Zusatz zur Baraita (III) unerwähnt. Deshalb kann er das schammaitische דבר als "anstößige Dinge" (דברים) und das schammaitische ערוה als "Unzucht" (ונות) verstehen.

(30) Schon aufgrund des Anfangsdialogs A und B stellt NEUSNER fest, daß das *auch wenn...* zweifellos Abhängigkeit des hillelitischen Lemmas vom schammaitischen besage; in sich allein wäre die hillelitische Aussage nicht verständlich (*Rabbinic Traditions* II, 38). Mit Hilfe einer neueren Methode kommt er dann zur Schlußfolgerung: Die Quellen vermitteln den

Das extensive Verständnis, welches auch den Verstoßungsgrund der anderen Schule gelten läßt und welches im Zusatz zur Baraita (III) Bet-Hillel zugeschrieben ist, erweist sich in einem völlig polemischen Rahmen in der Tat nicht nur als konzilient, sondern, wie es scheint, auch als Neuerung gegenüber der zitierten Exegese Bet-Schammai. In diesem Sinn äußert sich die Gemara<sup>(31)</sup> in yGit 9,11 (50d) bezüglich des aufgrund von Lev 15 geforderten Verhaltens einer menstruierenden Frau (Niddah): Die "früheren Gelehrten" waren wie Bet-Schammai der Ansicht, daß diese Frau keine Kosmetika benutzen dürfte. R. Akiba meinte dagegen, eine solche Regelung könne die Frau in den Augen ihres Mannes abstoßend erscheinen lassen und zur Scheidung führen. Die Gemara erkennt in den beiden Auffassungen die Anwendung der Halachot A bzw. C und schließt mit der Bemerkung, daß die Auffassung R. Akibas mit der Auffassung Bet-Hillels übereinstimme, im Gegensatz zu Bet-Schammai und den früheren Gelehrten. In dieselbe Richtung dürfte die Ausdehnung von Dtn 24,4a auf Num 5,11ff. weisen: Das dem Mann von Dtn 24,1 auferlegte Verbot, seine geschiedene Frau als Gattin zurückzunehmen (24,4a), wird auf den Mann angewandt, der sich von einer Sotah, deren Ehebruch erwiesen ist, geschieden hat. Auch wenn diese Frau in der Zwischenzeit keine neue Ehe eingegangen ist, darf er sie nicht zurücknehmen (SifDtn 270; bYev 11b). Eine solche Exegese setzt einerseits einen schwerwiegenden Grund für die Verstoßung voraus (ערוה) und andererseits eine Lesung des dtn Gesetzes, bei der sich 24,4a logischerweise an 24,1 anschließt, ohne Rücksicht auf die in 24,2-3 aufgezählten Zwischenstufen. Dieser Lesung begegnen wir bei Bet-Schammai; ihre Anwen-

---

Eindruck, daß vor 70 n. Chr. Bet-Schammai und danach Bet-Hillel die führende Stelle innehatte (*Rabbinic Traditions* III, 266). Vorbehalte gegenüber der allgemeinen, vor allem von A. Geiger vertretenen und von anderen übernommenen These, wonach Bet-Schammai die alte Halacha und Bet-Hillel die neue und fortschrittliche lehrte, werden von E. E. URBACH vorgebracht (*The Halakhah. Its Sources and Development* [Jerusalem 1986] 269-270). Der Fall des geraubten und in einem Gebäude eingebauten Balkens (tBQ 10,5; yBQ 9,1 [6d]; bGit 55a), den Urbach als Beispiel heranzieht, lasse sich schwerlich mit der genannten These in Einklang bringen. Keiner der drei genannten Forscher geht auf die historische Abfolge in der Entwicklung unserer Halachot A, B und C näher ein.

<sup>(31)</sup> Bezeichnung für die im palästinischen (Jerusalemer) und babylonischen Talmud vorgelegten Diskussionen und Erklärungen über die Mischna.

dung in einer hillelitischen Rechtsinstitution erklärt sich am besten dadurch, daß es sich um eine fest etablierte vorhillelitische Tradition handelt.

Was den exegetischen und lehrmäßigen Beitrag R. Akibas (C) bezüglich der Verstoßungsgründe betrifft, so setzt seine Halacha bereits ein Syntagma vor dem ערות דבר der Hillel-Schammai-Kontroverse ein. Die Interpretation der aufeinanderfolgenden אם und כי jeweils im konditionalen Sinn ("wenn sie nicht Gunst in seinen Augen findet [oder] wenn er an ihr ערות דבר gefunden hat"; vgl. bGit 90a) erlaubt es ihm lexikalisch, die Verstoßungsgründe zu erweitern. Von der Sache her kann die Begründung von C nicht als reine Erweiterung der Exegese seiner Vorgänger angesehen werden; denn der Grund für die Verstoßung berührt indirekt die Auffassung von der Ehe, welche R. Akiba als eine Liebesgemeinschaft zwischen den Ehepartnern sieht (vgl. ARN A 26)<sup>(32)</sup>.

3. Wir können hier nicht bei der linguistischen Erörterung der Wortverbindung ערות דבר verweilen. Bet-Hillel gliedert sie in seine Elemente auf und sieht hier zwei nebeneinanderstehende, alternative Verstoßungsgründe: entweder ערה oder דבר<sup>(33)</sup>. Der Zusatz zur Baraita (III) läßt erkennen, daß die Schule Hillels in der Auseinan-

<sup>(32)</sup> S. auch Z. FRANKEL, דרכי המשנה (Leipzig 1859) 119; J. GOLDIN, "Toward a Profile of the Tanna, Aqiba ben Joseph", *JAOS* 96 (1976) 49-50. Frankel bemerkt, daß die Auffassung R. Akibas bezüglich seines zusätzlichen Scheidungsgrundes zunächst befremdend wirke, zumal er das Gebot: "Du sollst deinen Nächsten lieben wie dich selbst" (Lev 19,18) als ein großes Prinzip in der Tora bezeichnet hat (Sifra, Qedoshim 4 = yNed 9,3 [41c]; GenR 24,7). R. Akibas Urteil stütze sich aber auf folgende Überlegung: Wenn ein Mann in einem Herzen Liebe zu einer anderen Frau unterhalte, dann trinke er aus einem anderen Becher (denke beim ehelichen Verkehr an die andere Frau), und dies sei so schlimm und vor Gott so verhaßt wie Ehebruch; deshalb sei es in diesem Fall besser, sich von seiner Frau zu scheiden. – Zu Frankels Begründung für die Auffassung R. Akibas vgl. auch Mt 5,27-28.

<sup>(33)</sup> Die Reihenfolge der beiden Begriffe in H kann sich auf das biblische ערות דבר stützen; syntaktisch leichter würde sich jedoch die Exegese Bet-Hillels an die von der Mischna Bet-Schammai in den Mund gelegte Variante דבר ערה anschließen. Die Verbindung ist nicht als St. cstr. aufgefaßt, sondern als zwei nebeneinander stehende Lexeme, die leicht als zwei Alternativen umschrieben werden können. Die Exegese Bet-Schammais wird dagegen von der Wortfolge der dieser Schule zugeschriebenen Variante ebenso wie von der Lesart der biblischen St.-cstr.-Verbindung unterstützt.

dersetzung mit der Schule Schammais ihre Position genauer festgelegt hat: Die Wortverbindung ist sowohl als *או ערוה או דבר* wie auch als *ערוה בדבר* zu verstehen (J).

Bet-Schammai legt die Wortverbindung im Sinne von *ערוה בדבר* (G) aus. Der Ausdruck, den wir hier im allgemeinen unübersetzt lassen, wird im Zusatz zur Baraita in bGit 90a (III) als "bezeugte Blöße" exegetisch erklärt, wobei *דבר* mittels der hermeneutischen Regel *gezerah shawah* aufgrund von Dtn 19,15 als der formelle Aspekt (Bezeugung) interpretiert wird. Dank der in den Baraitot in bGit 90a/b und yGit 9,11 (50d) = ySot 1,1 (16b) aufgezählten Beispiele gewinnt man, was *ערוה בדבר* betrifft, eine konkrete Vorstellung. Die erste Baraita (bGit 90a/b) bringt folgende konkrete Fälle, die sie unter der *ערוה* von 24,1b subsumiert sehen will:

eine Frau, "die mit entblößtem Haupt in die Öffentlichkeit geht, mit an beiden Seiten aufgetrennten Kleidern auf der Straße spinnt und mit Männern badet<sup>(34)</sup>... Es ist ein Gebot der Tora<sup>(35)</sup>, sie zu verstoßen; denn es heißt: 'weil er an ihr *ערוה*... gefunden hat... und er schicke sie fort aus seinem Haus... und sie gehe hin und gehöre einem anderen Mann' (24,1-2)"<sup>(36)</sup>.

Die Bar. in yGit 9,11 (50d) zitiert ähnliche Fälle, die von Bet-Hillel und Bet-Schammai auf ihre exegetische Begründung hinterfragt werden:

Woher [wissen wir, daß auch] diejenige fortgeht, die mit entblößtem Haupt, mit an den Seiten aufgetrennten Kleidern und entblößten Armen in die Öffentlichkeit geht? Die Schrift lehrt: "...weil er an ihr *ערוה* gefunden hat" (24,1b).

Bei den genannten Fällen, die offensichtlich von beiden Schulen als Gründe für pflichtmäßige Verstoßung betrachtet werden, handelt es sich nach den traditionellen Kommentaren um "etwas zu *ערוה*

<sup>(34)</sup> D. h. nach der Gemara (bGit 90b): an einem Ort, wo Männer baden.

<sup>(35)</sup> Der Ausdruck *מן התורה* bezeichnet die vom mosaischen Gesetz abgeleiteten Schlußfolgerungen, welche im allgemeinen dieselbe Autorität und Heiligkeit wie jenes besitzen; vgl. M. MIELZINER, *Introduction to the Talmud* (New York 1968) 122.

<sup>(36)</sup> Zu beachten ist, daß das Bibelzitat über die Grenzen der ersten schammaitischen Gesetzesnorm (24,1-2a) hinausgeht. Da es auch 24,2b einschließt, stellt es die spezifische Exegese Bet-Hillels dar.

Analoges" (דבר שנראה כעץ ערוה)<sup>(37)</sup>. Diese Interpretationen verstehen die Wortverbindung ערוה דבר im hillelitischen Sinn als zwei Begriffe, die den Grund für die Verstoßung angeben: hier also nicht nur ערוה, sondern auch דבר ערוה.

In ySot 1,1 (16b), wo die eben zitierte Baraita ebenfalls erscheint, kommt das schammaitische Verständnis (ערוה בדבר) deutlicher zum Vorschein. Es geht um die Frage, ob es nach Num 5,14 dem Mann freisteht oder ob er verpflichtet ist, seiner Frau gegenüber Eifersucht zu äußern. R. Eliëser spricht sich für die Verpflichtung aus, R. Josua für die Freistellung. Die Auffassung des ersten, die nach der Gemara mit derjenigen Bet-Schammais übereinstimmt, läßt nur ערוה als Grund für die Verstoßung zu. Man muß also, um die Situation zu klären, die Schuld der Sotah nachweisen; denn der Ehemann darf einerseits das Zusammenleben mit ihr nicht aufrechterhalten, nachdem er an ihr anstößige Dinge (דברים כאוין) entdeckt hat; andererseits darf er aufgrund dessen die Frau nicht verstoßen, weil ihm kein Beweis von ערוה vorliegt. Die Auffassung des zweiten, die nach der Gemara mit derjenigen Bet-Hillels übereinstimmt, erlaubt es, sowohl eine Verdächtige wie eine Schuldige zu verstoßen und also die Situation zu entscheiden, ohne auf das Gesetz von Num 5,11ff. zurückzugreifen. Angesichts der rigorosen Auffassung R. Eliëser weist R. Josua als Schwierigkeit auf die auch sonst anerkannte Legitimität der drei traditionellen Fälle der Scheidung wegen "anstößiger Dinge" und auf ihre biblische Rechtfertigung nach Dtn 24,1b hin. R. Eliëser's Lösung, die mit der Exegese und Lehre Bet-Schammais übereinstimmt, wird dank des Falls der Sotah, der zu den drei genannten Fällen analog ist, ersichtlich: Der Ehemann kann und muß seine der "anstößigen Dinge" beschuldigte Frau verstoßen, wenn er an ihr ערוה דבר (24,1b) gefunden hat. Nach Bet-Schammai heißt dies im Anschluß an den Zusatz zur Baraita bGit 90a (III) und mit der Erklärung der Gemara von ySot 1,1: a) einerseits ערוה als Grund für die Verstoßung; im vorliegenden Fall: פחירה, also die Tatsache, daß sich die des Ehebruchs verdächtige Frau mit einem bestimmten Mann an einem geheimen Ort aufgehalten hat; b) andererseits דבר als Voraussetzung für die Form der Rechtshandlung nach Dtn 19,15; im vorliegenden Fall: קניי, also

<sup>(37)</sup> Vgl. z. B. *Qorban ha-Edah*; ähnlich *Pene Moshe*, Ridbaz; ebenso CH. ALBECK, Anhang zu seiner *Mischna-Ausgabe*, Seder Nashim (Jerusalem 1955) 407.

der Ritus, in dem der Ehemann seine Eifersucht vor Zeugen ausspricht (vgl. mSot 1,1-2). Also hat ערה דבר für Bet-Schammai in ySot 1,1 wie in bGit 90a die Bedeutung ערה בדבר<sup>(38)</sup>. Wenn wir jetzt zu den in den Baraitot genannten Fällen zurückkehren, müssen wir unterstreichen, daß sie sich nach Bet-Schammai auf ein Vergehen der Frau beziehen, das in der Öffentlichkeit begangen wurde, also auf eine ערה (Blöße), die auf das Wort von zwei oder drei Zeugen leicht bestätigt werden kann.

Die genannten Quellen beziehen ערה auf bestimmte entblößte Körperteile der Frau und damit auf ein Verhalten, das auf lockere Sitten schließen läßt. Zu beachten ist also, daß Bet-Schammai nicht "einzig und allein Ehebruch als Scheidungsgrund" anerkennt, wie oft fälschlicherweise behauptet wird<sup>(39)</sup>. Ehebruch fällt an sich nicht unter das Ehescheidungsgesetz und zieht eigentlich die Todesstrafe nach sich. Entsprechendes gilt von dem Verdacht auf Ehebruch: Falls die im Mischna-Traktat Soṭah behandelten rechtlichen Voraussetzungen gegeben sind, wird die Frau dem Ritual von Num 5 unterworfen. Erst nach Abschaffung der Todesstrafe und des "Bitterwasser"-Rituals<sup>(40)</sup> wird Ehebruch und berechtigter Verdacht auf Ehebruch im allgemeinen durch das Ehescheidungsgesetz geregelt.

<sup>(38)</sup> Mit anderen Worten: das schammaitische דבר des Jerushalmi steht nach unserer Interpretation nicht im Gegensatz zu dem des Babli, wie es z. B. für *Pene Moshe, Qorban ha-Edah*, Ridbaz, STEINSALTZ (Ausgabe von bGit, S. 386 [עירום]) der Fall ist; vgl. ALBECK, Anhang zu seiner Mischna-Ausgabe, 407.

<sup>(39)</sup> Vgl. z. B. L. BLAU, *Die jüdische Ehescheidung und der jüdische Scheidebrief I* (Budapest 1911) 35. Zur Interpretation in unserem Sinn vgl. A. Díez MACHO, *Indisolubilidad del matrimonio y divorcio en la Biblia. La sexualidad en la Biblia*. (Madrid 1978) 178-181 mit Anm. 158. — Was ערה bei Bet-Hillel betrifft, so dürften verschiedene Zeiten, Orte und Umstände dazu beigetragen haben, daß der Begriff einen beweglicheren Umfang annahm und rechtsanalog auch Scheidungsgründe deckte, die begrifflich nicht mehr direkt mit "Blöße" zusammenhingen. So werden allmählich die ursprünglichen in den zitierten Baraitot genannten Fälle nicht mehr als ערה bezeichnet, sondern dem Begriff des Verstoßes gegen mosaisches Gesetz und jüdische Sitte untergeordnet (vgl. m/tKet 7,6).

<sup>(40)</sup> Ersteres soll nach ySan 1,1 [18a] und bSan 41a vierzig Jahre vor der Tempelzerstörung (70 n. Chr.), nach bSab 52b und bKet 30a mit der Tempelzerstörung erfolgt sein; letzteres spätestens bei der Zerstörung des Tempels; vgl. mSot 9,9; tSot 14,1-2.

4. Als Antwort auf die Ablehnung der Interpretation von *ערוך דבר* als zwei alternative Verstoßungsgründe untersucht Bet-Hillel zunächst die gesetzliche Materie von 24,1-2a<sup>(41)</sup> und danach die von 24,1-2, um die Halacha des Gegners zu verwerfen. So liefert uns die Baraita (II) zuerst eine auf 24,1-2a beruhende Parallele (D) zu der in der Mischna zitierten Halacha Bet-Schammai's (A) bezüglich der rechtmäßigen Verstoßung. Nach Bet-Hillel stützt sich Bet-Schammai auf ein restriktives Verständnis von *ערוך דבר*, welches unter Außer-acht-lassen eines Wortes im biblischen Text, nämlich *דבר*, erreicht werde; dagegen müsse aber vom exegetischen Standpunkt Einspruch erhoben werden: "(in 24,1) heißt es aber auch *דבר*". Nachdem unter starker Betonung des *דבר* von 24,1 als unabhängigen und hinreichendem Verstoßungsgrund die gegnerische Position zurückgewiesen ist, geht Bet-Hillel zur Exegese von 24,1-2 über und leitet dabei die eigene Halacha, diesmal bezüglich der zweiten Heirat der verstoßenen Frau, ab. Nach Bet-Hillel ist 24,1-2 eine aus zwei Rechtsabsätzen bestehende zusammengehörige Einheit; 24,2 ist gesetzlicher Zusatz zu 24,1 betreffs der rechtlichen Folgen des traditionellen Scheidebriefs (*get*)<sup>(42)</sup>. Die Formulierung E' ist klarer als E; beide sind im Ausdruck adäquater und im Inhalt umfassender als die obige Halacha B, deren Gegenstück sie darstellen und in der sich Bet-Hillel nur auf die Verstoßung nach dem ersten seiner beiden Lexeme beschränkt.

(41) Dies ist die erste Gesetzesnorm nach Bet-Schammai. Das erste *wəqatal* von 24,2 wird also zur Apodosis von 24,1 gezogen, und zwar als das letzte in der Viererreihe des Nachsatzes. Diese Abteilung ist auch von der Peschitta her bekannt, wo die erste Apodosis folgendermaßen aufgegliedert ist: *nktwb lh* (ohne *w-*)... *wntl lh wšryh wtpwq mn byth*. Dann folgt der Anfang der zweiten Gesetzesnorm: (24,2b) *w'n t'zl* (mit Wiederholung der Konjunktion) *wthw*...

Mit dem Rest von 24,2 beginnt nach Bet-Schammai die Protasis der zweiten Gesetzesnorm, deren Apodosis 24,3a bildet; 24,3b ist alternativer Zusatz.

(42) D. h.: Entlassung der Frau aus der Gewalt des Ehemanns und Recht auf Ehe mit einem anderen Mann. Vgl. die Formel, die in der Mischna R. Jehuda zugeschrieben ist: "Und dies sei dir von mir Verstoßungsurkunde und Entlassungsbrief und Befreiungsquittung, damit du gehen kannst, um dich, mit wem du willst, zu verheiraten" (mGit 9,3). In die gleiche Richtung geht der in das Jahr 111 n. Chr. datierte palästinische Scheidebrief Mur 19 (DJD II [1960] 105-106). Auch Josephus stellt in bezug auf den Scheidebrief ausdrücklich fest: "so wird sie nämlich das Recht erhalten, mit einem anderen [ehelich] zu leben" (*Ant* IV 253).

5. Auf der nächsten Stufe in der Entwicklung der Baraita ist die Formulierung F' wiederum klarer als F. Auch der Satz F/F' verdient unseres Erachtens die Bezeichnung Halacha. Es handelt sich um eine andere von Bet-Hillel bekämpfte Gesetzesnorm, die in den zahlreichen Studien über die Kontroversen zwischen Bet-Hillel und Bet-Schammai bis jetzt nicht erkannt worden ist und die erst kürzlich von J. Maier, offensichtlich im Namen einer zu selbstsicheren hillelitischen "Dogmatik", allzu schnell abgelehnt wurde: "Von einem Verbot, eine Geschiedene zu heiraten, kann keine Rede sein..."<sup>(43)</sup>. Diese nicht kanonische Halacha, die sich inhaltlich an A = D anschließt, führen wir aufgrund des eindeutigen Kontextes der Kontroverse auf Bet-Schammai zurück.

Dieselbe Lehre F/F' ist nach unserer Interpretation in der folgenden Baraita von yGit 9,11 (50d) ausdrücklich Bet-Schammai zugeschrieben. Die Bar. zitiert zunächst die Halacha Bet-Schammais, wonach man nur aufgrund von ערוה seine Frau verstoßen darf; es folgt die Frage, welches dann die exegetische Begründung für die drei Fälle ist, die traditionsgemäß ebenfalls die Verstoßung nach sich ziehen; als Antwort auf diese Frage wird im Geist Bet-Hillels 24,1b angeführt. Der Text lautet:

Und siehe, Bet-Schammai lehrt: Ich kenne [als rechtmäßig] nur den Fall an, daß [eine Frau] aufgrund von ערוה allein fortgeht (24,1b-2a). — Und woher [wissen wir, daß auch] diejenige fortgeht, die mit entblößtem Haupt, mit an den Seiten aufgetrennten Kleidern und entblößten Armen in die Öffentlichkeit geht? Die Schrift lehrt: "... weil er an ihr ערוה דבר gefunden hat" (24,1b)<sup>(44)</sup>.

Sodann wird gefragt, was sich nach Bet-Schammai aus dem Gesagten für den Rest des Gesetzes ergibt<sup>(45)</sup>: "Was wollen die von Bet-

<sup>(43)</sup> J. MAIER, Rez.: R. NEUDECKER, Früh rabbinisches Ehescheidungsrecht. Der Tosefta-Traktat Giṭṭin (Roma 1982), *Henoch* 6 (1984) 104.

<sup>(44)</sup> Vgl. oben S. 368-369.

<sup>(45)</sup> Für I. HALEVY, *דורות הראשונים* I,3 (Frankfurt 1906) 725-727, der die in unserer nächsten Anm. erwähnten Erklärungen von *Pene Moshe* und *Qorban ha-Edah* ausdrücklich ablehnt, schließt sich die Frage des Jerushalmi an die im Text der Baraita ausgelassene und also zu ergänzende Halacha R. Akibas (s. oben C) an: Ist nach Bet-Schammai das "wenn sie nicht Gunst in seinen Augen findet" nicht überflüssig, und würde im biblischen Text nicht "weil er an ihr ערוה דבר gefunden hat" genügen? Antwort nach Halevy: Beides hat seine Bedeutung, damit man nicht den falschen Schluß zieht: Diejenige Frau, welche aufgrund von ערוה דבר geschieden wurde, sei ihrem ersten Mann zur Wiederheirat (24,4a) verboten, und



Schammai [damit] feststellen?" Eine polemische Antwort, die in ihrer Form wie ein Gegenstück zu dem in SifDtn auf F' folgenden hillelitischen Argument ("Und wundere dich nicht...") wirkt, bringt in klarem Kontrast zu Bet-Hillel die Lehre Bet-Schammais zum Ausdruck, einschließlich des Punktes F/F', der uns hier interessiert:

Daß du nicht sagen darfst, daß [die Frau], welche aufgrund von ערוה fortgeht (24,1b-2a), [ihrem Mann] verboten (24,4a), [einem anderen aber erlaubt sei (24,2b), und die, welche] aufgrund einer anderen Sache (דבר אחר) [fortgeht] (24,1b-2a), [ihrem Mann oder einem anderen] erlaubt sei<sup>(46)</sup>.

Bet-Hillel verwirft also die Halacha F/F', nicht jedoch, ohne ihr vorher ein Vernunftargument zu liefern: "Und wundere dich nicht [über diese Meinung]: Wenn sie [aufgrund von ערוה] demjenigen (nämlich ihrem Mann) verboten ist, der [allein ihr bis dahin] erlaubt war, sollte sie dann [nach der Scheidung aufgrund von ערוה] nicht [erst recht] demjenigen (nämlich jedem fremden Mann) verboten sein, der ihr [bis dahin] verboten war?!" Dieses Argument, das vielleicht ursprünglich auf Bet-Schammai zurückgeht, dient Bet-Hillel im jetzigen Kontext vor allem dazu, die exegetische Widerlegung der gegnerischen Position vorzubereiten.

Der eigentliche Beweis für die Halacha F/F', also dafür, daß 24,2b<sup>(47)</sup> als Protasis aufzufassen ist und 24,3 als Apodosis mit der Alternative "entweder soll er sie hassen, oder er wird sicher sterben",

diejenige, welche aufgrund einer anderen Sache, d. h.: "wenn sie nicht Gunst in seinen Augen findet", geschieden wurde, sei ihm zur Wiederheirat erlaubt.

<sup>(46)</sup> Für FELDBLUM, פירושים, 222-223, ist die Antwort identisch mit derjenigen, die er in SifDtn 269 findet; vgl. Anm. 29. *Pene Moshe* bezieht die Antwort in enger Anlehnung an SifDtn 269 und bGit 90aBar nur auf 24,2b; *Qorban ha-Edah* und Ridbaz nur auf 24,4a. Die ganze Dynamik und Polemik der Lehre Bet-Schammais kommt jedoch nur dann zum Ausdruck, wenn man beider Beziehungen Rechnung trägt. Für *Qorban ha-Edah* und Ridbaz sind mit דבר אחר die drei vorher genannten "zu ערוה analogen" Fälle gemeint; für uns steht דבר אחר in direktem Gegensatz zu der ערוה, die Bet-Schammai einige Zeilen vorher als exklusiven rechtlichen Grund für die Verstoßung nach 24,1 genannt hat.

Im Anschluß an den oben übersetzten Text zitiert die Gemara im Sinne Bet-Hillels eine von R. Schela vorgetragene angebliche Schwierigkeit bezüglich Bet-Schammais Exegese von 24,4a und löst diese Schwierigkeit nach Bet-Hillel (s. S. 377).

<sup>(47)</sup> Bzw., wenn die Lesung vom Anfang her wiederaufgenommen wird, 24,1-2.

wird aus einer viel zitierten Baraita<sup>(48)</sup> ersichtlich, die schon an anderer Stelle Gegenstand einer kurzen Untersuchung war<sup>(49)</sup>. Dort wurde auch ihre ursprüngliche Zugehörigkeit zu Bet-Schammai oder wenigstens zu einer Lehre, die Bet-Hillel grundsätzlich entgegengesetzt ist und mit Bet-Schammai in Einklang steht, zu begründen versucht. In der Version von bGit 90b stellt die Baraita bezüglich 24,2-3 fest:

“Hat er sie aus seinem Haus fortgeschickt [...] und ist sie hingegangen und hat sie [als Gattin] einem anderen Mann gehört...” (24,1b-2). Die Schrift nennt ihn “einen anderen”, um [damit] zu sagen, daß dieser dem ersten nicht gleich ist. Jener hat eine böse [Frau] [aufgrund von ערוה<sup>(50)</sup>] aus seinem Haus entfernt, dieser aber hat eine böse [Frau] in sein Haus geholt. Ist der zweite rechtschaffen, “schickt er sie fort”, denn es heißt: “so hasse sie der letztere Mann” (24,3a); wenn [er es] aber nicht [tut], begräbt sie ihn, denn es heißt: “sonst wird der letztere Mann sicher sterben” (24,3b). Er verdient den Tod, weil jener eine böse [Frau] aus seinem Haus entfernt hat, dieser aber eine böse [Frau] in sein Haus geholt hat.

Die Dtn-Stellen (24,3a und 3b) können in dieser Baraita nicht anders als nach unserer Übersetzung verstanden werden. “Hassen” ist im rechtlichen Kontext der Ehescheidung nicht einfach als Gefühl bzw. Leidenschaft zu verstehen. Es handelt sich vielmehr um einen Begriff, der den Grund für die rechtmäßige Verstoßung ausdrückt und der in diesem Sinn auch als Scheidungsformel verwendet wird<sup>(51)</sup>. Die Apodosis der zweiten schammaitischen Gesetzesnorm (24,3a) enthält also das Gebot für denjenigen, der eine wegen ערוה geschiedene Frau — etwa unter dem Zwang der Leidenschaft<sup>(52)</sup> oder aus Irrtum — geheiratet hat, sie zu verstoßen, was soviel bedeutet wie das Verbot, sie von Anfang an zu heiraten.

J. Maier meint, den halachischen Wert von F/F' leugnen zu dürfen, indem er die exegetische Begründung als Gedankenspiel hin-

<sup>(48)</sup> Vgl. bGit 90b; ySot 1,7[17a]; tSot 5,90; NumR 9,12.

<sup>(49)</sup> NEUDECKER, *Ehescheidungsrecht*, 9-10, Anm. 16.

<sup>(50)</sup> Dieser Grund für die pflichtmäßige Verstoßung ist in ySot 1,7(17a) und NumR 9,12 im Sinne Bet-Schammais ausdrücklich genannt; in tSot 5,9 (Ms. Wien) steht im Sinne Bet-Hillels עבירה (Übertretung eines Gebots der jüdischen Sitte).

<sup>(51)</sup> Vgl. R. YARON, “Aramaic Marriage Contracts from Elephantine”, *JSS* 3 (1958) 32ff.; S. GREENGUS, “The Old Babylonian Marriage Contract”, *JAOS* 89 (1969) 518, Anm. 61.

<sup>(52)</sup> Vgl. tSot 5,9 (Ms. Wien); ySot 1,7(17a); NumR 9,12: “er ist durch sie zu Fall gekommen”.

stellt. Das ist u. E. doch wohl ein Paralogismus. Wir glauben nämlich ganz und gar nicht, die Kontroverse zwischen Bet-Hillel und Bet-Schammai "mißdeutet" zu haben, indem wir sie mit ihrer biblischen Grundlage so, wie die rabbinischen Quellen sie sehen, in Verbindung brachten; die wiederholten Berufungen auf das dtn Gesetz machen dies notwendig.

Sogar die für den Hillelismus an sich inkonsequente Lehre, wonach eine Ehe mit einer wegen ערוה oder עבירה geschiedenen Frau zwar nicht rechtswidrig ist, jedoch von ihr abgeraten wird<sup>(53)</sup>, bezeugt in ihrer polemischen Art die hier für Bet-Schammai vorgeschlagene Lesung von 24,1-3. Weder die durchgehende Lesung von 24,1-2 oder von 24,3-4a noch die Lehre vom Scheidebrief (*get*) unterscheiden bei Bet-Hillel und im späteren normativen Rabbinismus zwischen den Gründen für eine obligatorische und denen für eine fakultative Verstoßung. Die Aufmerksamkeit, mit der Bet-Hillel in unserer Baraita (II) die Gründe für eine obligatorische Verstoßung betrachtet, geht auf die Auseinandersetzung mit Bet-Schammai zurück, und die Warnung vor der Ehe mit einer so geschiedenen Frau dürfte den Eindruck vermitteln wollen, daß Bet-Hillel auch schammaitische Standpunkte in das eigene Lehrsystem integriert hat (vgl. bEr 13b).

*Halten wir also fest:* Bei dem Versuch, die Halacha F/F' exegetisch zu widerlegen, hält sich Bet-Hillel immer an den eigenen Rahmen: 24,1-2 ist eine aus zwei Rechtsabsätzen bestehende zusammengehörige Einheit. Mit dieser Voraussetzung sieht sich Bet-Hillel imstande, die gegnerische Auffassung von 24,2b-3 als Fehlinterpretation des dtn Gesetzes hinzustellen.

Die Position Bet-Schammais und ihre Widerlegung vom Standpunkt Bet-Hillels aus läßt sich folgendermaßen zusammenfassen:

a. In seiner ersten Gesetzesnorm (24,1-2a) betrachtet Bet-Schammai ערוה als einzigen Grund für die Verstoßung der schuldigen Frau, und diese Verstoßung wird dort Gegenstand der Regelung: "...hat er an ihr bezeugte Blöße gefunden, so... zieht sie aus seinem Haus"; vgl. F': "Die wegen Blöße forgeht ...".

<sup>(53)</sup> Vgl. SifDtn 270; MHG zu Dtn 24,3: Die Ausdrücke "hassen" und "sterben" von 24,3 werden nach hillelitischem Verständnis als ein schlechtes Omen für die Ehe mit einer wegen ערוה geschiedenen Frau betrachtet. Der Mann, der eine solche Frau, wenn auch erlaubterweise, heiratet, wird sie hassen, oder sie wird ihn begraben.

b. Die ערוה der Frau, die also aufgrund von 24,1-2a die pflichtmäßige Verstoßung nach sich zieht, erlaubt nach Bet-Schammai aufgrund von 24,2b-3 keinerlei zweite Ehe mit ihr; vgl. F: "Die wegen Blöße fortgeht, darf nicht [wieder] geheiratet werden".

c. Nach Bet-Hillel, der 24,2a + b als Zusatz zu 24,1 auffaßt, stellt dagegen die ערוה von 24,1 kein gesetzliches Hindernis für eine neue Ehe dar. Die Halacha F/F' könne nur dann aufrechterhalten werden, wenn es in 24,1 nicht auch ערוה hieße. Mit der Feststellung, daß die Schrift ausdrücklich auch von ערוה spreche, und der Darstellung des eigenen Verständnisses von 24,1-2 ist nach Bet-Hillel die gegnerische Position widerlegt: "Die Schrift lehrt: 'ערוה ... und ist sie hingegangen [, um einem anderen Mann zu gehören], so gehöre sie [als Gattin] einem anderen Mann'" (Ende der Baraita SifDtn 269).

Wir engen also die Kontroverse nicht auf das Schema ערוה – דבר, das die Mischna beherrscht, ein und stellen im Gegensatz zum üblichen, der normativen hillelitischen Lehre und Praxis von der Ehescheidung angepaßten Verständnis die Existenz der schammaitischen Halacha F/F' als sicher hin. Sie stellt notwendigerweise den Sachverhalt des traditionellen Scheidebriefs in Frage<sup>(54)</sup>.

Einschränkend ist jedoch zu bemerken, daß wir hier nur die Auslegungen Bet-Hillels und Bet-Schammais zu Dtn 24,1-4 betrachten, wonach also die Ehescheidung vom Mann ausgeht, und zwar aufgrund von ערוה דבר bei der Frau. Das rabbinische Recht kennt auch einen anderen Weg zur Ehescheidung: Unter bestimmten Voraussetzungen ist die Frau berechtigt, eine Scheidung zu beantragen, und ein Gericht kann auf den Mann, wenn er sich der

(<sup>54</sup>) Nicht unbegründet ist vor allem die Frage, ob der Scheidebrief immer schon wie im späteren normativen Recht die völlige Freiheit zur Heirat mit jeder geschiedenen Frau zugestanden hat. Kritische Stimmen wie L. BLAU, *Die jüdische Ehescheidung und der jüdische Scheidebrief I* (Budapest 1911) 35-37, scheinen einen gewissen Zweifel seitens Bet-Schammais an der Gültigkeit des hillelitischen Scheidebriefs anzumelden. E. KOFFMAHN, *Die Doppelurkunden aus der Wüste Juda* (STDJ 5; Leiden 1968) 133-135, fragt sich angesichts von Mur 115 (griechisch; 124 n. Chr.) ebenfalls über die beschriebenen rechtlichen Folgen. Philo trägt zu dieser Frage nichts bei, und BERGERS These von der "bloßen Formalität" (*Gesetzesauslegung I*, 520) beruht auf einer unberechtigten Verallgemeinerung.

Scheidung widersetzt, Druck ausüben, ihr den Scheidebrief auszustellen<sup>(55)</sup>.

6. 24,4a erweist sich als eine dritte, von Bet-Schammai anerkannte Gesetzesnorm, deren Anfang durch die vorausgehende Einheit 24,2b-3 bestimmt ist. In der Tat verbirgt sich hinter der konditionalen Protasis des rationalen hillelitischen Arguments zugunsten der Halacha F/F' eine schammaitische Lesung von 24,4a, die direkt mit 24,1b verknüpft ist: "Und wundere dich nicht: Wenn sie [aufgrund von ערה (24,1b)] demjenigen (ihrem Mann) verboten ist (24,4a)..." (SifDtn 269). Genau diese Lesung wird im Anschluß an die Baraita in yGit 9,11 (50d)<sup>(56)</sup> in der Gemara Bet-Schammai zugeschrieben. Hier bringt R. Schela aus Kefar-Tamarta<sup>(57)</sup> aus hillelitischer Sicht eine Schwierigkeit vor, mit der die Schule Schammais aufgrund ihrer Lesung von 24,4a angeblich konfrontiert ist:

Die [folgende] Schriftstelle macht denen von Bet-Schammai Schwierigkeit: "Es kann ihr erster Ehemann, der sie fortgeschickt hatte, sie nicht zurücknehmen" (24,4a). Worauf beziehen wir [die Stelle]? Wenn sie sie ihm [, wie Bet-Schammai behauptet, zur Wiederheirat] verbieten wollte (24,4a), so ist sie ihm ja bereits [wegen der ערה aufgrund von 24,1b] verboten! Vielmehr sind wir der Auffassung, daß [die Stelle] ihm [noch] ein Verbot auferlegt (24,3-4a).

Die vorgeschlagene Widerlegung und die alternative Interpretation setzen auch hier exegetische und lehrmäßige Standpunkte Bet-Hillels voraus. Unberücksichtigt bleiben:

a. Bet-Schammais eigene Aufteilung des dtn Gesetzes, nämlich 24,2b-3 und 24,4a, statt des hillelitischen 24,3-4a.

<sup>(55)</sup> So besonders im Fall von bestimmten schweren Krankheiten und von abstoßenden Berufen des Mannes (mKet 7,9-10; tKet 7,11). Daß auch Bet-Schammai die Scheidung bei bestimmten, im Interesse des Mannes liegenden Gelüben, welche die Rechte bzw. Pflichten der Frau einschränken, gelten ließ, ist im Fall der ehelichen Pflicht ausdrücklich bestätigt (m/tKet 5,6; mEd 4,10; tEd 2,4). Zu anderen derartigen Gelüben vgl. m/tKet Kap. 7; s. auch mNed 11,12. ALBECK, der offenbar die Breite der hillelitischen Scheidungsgründe möglichst auch für Bet-Schammai gelten lassen wollte, hat anhand dieser Fälle die ganze praktische Bedeutung der Auseinandersetzung über den rechtmäßigen Scheidungsgrund auf die Frage einengen wollen, ob die Frau der Scheidung zustimmt oder nicht; s. Anhang zu seiner Mischna-Ausgabe, 407-408; vgl. auch mit Vorbehalt HALEVY, דורות הראשונים I, 3, 729.

<sup>(56)</sup> S. oben S. 372-373

<sup>(57)</sup> Babylonischer Amoräer, ca. 2.-3. Jh.

b. In Verbindung damit: Bet-Schammais Unterscheidung zwischen dem Gebot, die Frau fortzuschicken (24,1b), und dem Verbot, sie als Ehefrau zurückzunehmen (24,4a). Für Bet-Hillel genügt 24,1b, um sowohl das zur Frage stehende Gebot als auch das Verbot auszudrücken: Der Grund, der die Scheidung der Frau zur Pflicht machte, nämlich עררה, verbietet auch die Wiederheirat mit ihr.

c. Die Begründung für das je verschieden aufgefaßte Verbot von 24,4a. "Nachdem sie verunreinigt worden ist" bezieht sich nach Bet-Schammai auf die עררה von 24,1b; nach Bet-Hillel auf den Vollzug der zweiten Ehe von 24,2b: nicht nur mit einer wegen עררה geschiedenen Frau ist eine Wiederheirat verboten, sondern auch mit einer aus anderen Gründen (דבר) geschiedenen, dann nämlich, wenn sie durch eine zweite Ehe verunreinigt wurde<sup>(58)</sup>.

Mit anderen Worten: 24,4a ist nach Bet-Hillel die Apodosis des zweiten Abschnitts des dtn Gesetzes (24,3-4a); dieser Abschnitt steht aber im Rahmen von 24,1-4a, also einer vom Anfang her wiederaufgenommenen Lesung, und betrifft einen Fall, der sich von 24,1 bis 24,3 in regelmäßiger Abfolge entwickelt. Nach Bet-Schammai ist 24,4a dagegen direkter Zusatz zu 24,1, der den Mann der verstoßenen Frau betrifft. Wir haben bei Bet-Schammai also eine nicht durchgehende Lesung von 24,1-4a vor uns; denn 24,2b-3 tritt als Parenthese auf, die mit einer weiteren Entwicklung des Falls, der durch 24,1 bereits vollständig entschieden ist, an sich nichts zu tun hat.

<sup>(58)</sup> Im Sinne Bet-Hillels vgl. SifDtn 270; bYev 11b; überliefert im Namen von R. Eleazar ben Asarja (1.-2. Jh. n. Chr.). — In der Exegese des NACHMANIDES (Mose ben Nachman; ed. Chavel, 462) treten die einzelnen Verbote besonders deutlich zutage: a) Er kennt im Anschluß an die rabbinische Tradition eine auf den Fall einer schuldig befundenen Sotah angewandte Exegese von 24,4 (vgl. SifDtn 270; bYev 11b), welche außer dem vorrangigen Gebot, sie zu verstoßen, das weitere Verbot einschließt, sie als Ehefrau zurückzunehmen. b) Indem er dann 24,4 in einem eigentlichen Kontext liest, entdeckt er in 24,4a zwei den Fall des ersten Mannes betreffende Verbote: Eines warnt vor der Wiederheirat mit der eigenen geschiedenen Frau, wenn sie nach der Scheidung wiederum verheiratet war (24,3-4a); das andere warnt vor der Wiederheirat mit der eigenen früheren Frau, die durch Unzucht (זנות) verunreinigt worden war und aus diesem Grund geschieden wurde (24,1b + 4a). Das letztere Verbot deckt sich mit der Exegese von 24,4a nach Bet-Schammai.

Die oben vorgelegten frührabbinischen Quellen und unsere Erklärungen dazu rechtfertigen es, die Lesungen des dtn Gesetzes nach Bet-Hillel und Bet-Schammai in der nachstehend dargestellten Weise zu rekonstruieren<sup>(59)</sup>.

## 2. *Rekonstruierte Lesungen von Dtn 24,1-4 nach Bet-Hillel und Bet-Schammai*

### *Vorbemerkungen*

1. Was das folgende Schema betrifft, so sind die Punkte, die von den beiden Schulen disputiert wurden bzw. die für die eine der beiden Seiten und nicht notwendigerweise auch für die andere kennzeichnend sind, durch einen zweifachen Doppelpunkt angezeigt. Ein einfacher Doppelpunkt verweist auf andere Unterschiede, die sich oft rein linguistisch aus dem Vorausgehenden ergeben. Um die scharfsinnigen und oft polemischen halachischen Diskussionen in ihrer inneren Kohärenz darzustellen, sind die in Klammern eingefügten Ergänzungen notwendig, wie sie in der Kolonne Bet-Schammais besonders stark auffallen.

2. Unter den anderen Unterschieden tritt in 24,1 die jeweilige Auffassung vom Grund für die Verstoßung besonders hervor. Die "bezeugte Blöße" (ערוה בדבר) von Bet-Schammai, ein nach Inhalt und Form außerordentlich schwerwiegender Grund, kommt in den Relativsätzen von 24,3b und 24,4a etwas versteckt wieder zum Vorschein. Nach Bet-Schammai bestimmen diese Relativsätze nicht das Subjekt — "der letztere Mann" bzw. "ihr erster Ehemann" —, sondern erklären in konjunkionaler Funktion den Fall; diesen Sachverhalt haben wir in der Übersetzung mit Hilfe von Kausalsätzen ausgedrückt.

3. Um auch die Auffassung Bet-Hillels möglichst zutreffend darzustellen, haben wir das Schreiben des Scheidebriefs noch in die Protasis einbezogen, und zwar auch im Sinne eines Bedingungssatzes mit volitiver Nuance: "wenn er ihr einen Scheidebrief schreiben will". Angesichts einer Vielzahl legitimer Scheidungsgründe bleibt es

<sup>(59)</sup> Die Rekonstruktion der beiden Lesungen ist mit einigen geringfügigen Unterschieden 1982 zum ersten Mal vorgelegt worden; vgl. NEUDECKER, *Ehescheidungsrecht*, 1-10.

nämlich nach dieser Schule dem Mann oft freigestellt, sich von seiner Frau zu trennen oder nicht<sup>(60)</sup>.

### *Rekonstruierte Lesungen*

*Bet-Hillel* (als zwei Abschnitte mit drei Rechtsabsätzen gelesen):

24,1-2 (aus zwei Rechtsabsätzen bestehende Einheit mit dem Mann bzw. der Frau als Subjekten):

<sup>1</sup>Nimmt ein Mann eine Frau und hat er ihr beigezwohnt und findet sie nun nicht Gunst in seinen Augen, weil er an ihr

entweder Blöße oder irgend etwas gefunden hat, und hat er ihr einen Scheidebrief geschrieben, so gebe er [ihn] in ihre Hand und schicke sie fort aus seinem Haus;

<sup>2</sup>ist sie dann aus seinem Haus gezogen

und hingegangen

[, um einem anderen Mann zu gehören],

so gehöre sie [als Gattin] einem anderen Mann.

24,3-4 (dritter Rechtsabsatz mit dem ersten Mann als Subjekt):

<sup>3</sup>Und hat der letztere Mann sie gehaßt

und ihr einen Scheidebrief geschrieben

und [ihn] in ihre Hand gegeben

und sie fortgeschickt aus seinem Haus

oder stirbt der letztere Mann,

*Bet-Schammai* (als drei Abschnitte mit drei Rechtsabsätzen gelesen):

24,1-2a (erster Rechtsabsatz mit dem Mann bzw. der Frau als Subjekten):

<sup>1</sup>Nimmt ein Mann eine Frau und hat er ihr beigezwohnt und findet sie nun nicht Gunst in seinen Augen, weil er an ihr

:: bezeugte Blöße

:: gefunden hat, so schreibe er ihr

:: einen Scheidebrief

:: und gebe [ihn] in ihre Hand und

schicke sie fort aus seinem Haus,

:: <sup>2</sup>und sie zieht aus seinem Haus;

24,2b-3 (zweiter Rechtsabsatz mit dem zweiten Mann als Subjekt):

:: ist sie dann hingegangen

:

:: und hat sie [als Gattin] einem

: anderen Mann gehört,

:: <sup>3</sup>so hasse sie der letztere Mann

: und schreibe ihr einen Scheidebrief

: und gebe [ihn] in ihre Hand

: und schicke sie fort aus seinem Haus;

:: sonst wird der letztere Mann sicher sterben,

<sup>(60)</sup> Mt 5,31 und 19,7 (δοῦναι) ist diesbezüglich genauer als die Parallele Mk 10,4 (γράφαι). Die Variante γράψῃ von 24,3 LXX (s. Anm. 7) sowie die Auslassung von "schreiben" in 24,3 Vg (s. Anm. 8) weisen ebenfalls in die Richtung der hillelitischen Exegese.



der sie sich zur Frau genommen hat,	:: weil er sie sich zur Frau genommen hat [und sie nicht fortgeschickt hat aus seinem Haus].
	24,4 (dritter Rechtsabsatz mit dem ersten Mann als Subjekt):
<sup>4</sup> [so] kann ihr erster Ehemann,	:: <sup>4</sup> Es kann ihr erster Ehemann,
der sie fortgeschickt hatte,	:: weil er sie hatte fortschicken [müssen], [ob sie inzwischen wieder geheiratet worden ist oder nicht,]
sie nicht zurücknehmen, daß sie ihm zur Frau sei, nachdem sie verunreinigt worden ist;	sie nicht zurücknehmen, daß sie ihm zur Frau sei, nachdem sie verunreinigt worden ist;
denn ein Greuel ist sie	:: [sonst] ist er/es sicher ein Greuel
vor YHWH — du sollst aber nicht beflecken das Land, das YHWH,	vor YHWH — du sollst aber nicht beflecken das Land, das YHWH,
dein Gott, dir als Erbe gibt.	dein Gott, dir als Erbe gibt.

### 3. Die Targumim

Abgesehen von verschiedenartigen Hinzufügungen stellen die Targumim eine Lehnübersetzung des hebräischen Textes dar. Deshalb werden, was die Syntax betrifft, außer bei Ps.-J. die aufeinanderfolgenden mit *w<sup>e</sup>qatal* eingeleiteten Satzglieder von 24,1-3 durch zehn *w<sup>e</sup>yiqtol* übertragen, so daß also das Problem der Aufteilung in Protasis und Apodosis bzw. in Protasen und Apodosen grundsätzlich dasselbe bleibt wie im MT. Unter den modernen Übersetzern des Onq. vertritt Etheridge (1862) den syntaktischen Standpunkt Bet-Hillels, Drazin (1982) den der modernen wissenschaftlichen Exegese. Die *editio princeps* des Neof. (1978) übernimmt in den drei mitabgedruckten Übersetzungen drei verschiedene Standpunkte: den Bet-Hillels (Díez Macho), den der Vg (Le Déaut) und den modernen (McNamara, Maher).

Ps.-J. unterbricht die Reihe der *w<sup>e</sup>yiqtol*, indem er zum einen an die vierte Stelle ein *ûq<sup>e</sup>tal* stellt (MT 24,2: רצאה = תפקת) und zum anderen 24,3 mit dem folgenden Zusatz (ebenfalls *ûq<sup>e</sup>tal*) einführt: "ist dann vom Himmel her...". Ps.-J. scheint also 24,1-4 als drei Rechtsabsätze zu lesen, so daß der am ehesten zutreffende Aufbau der Materie der folgende sein dürfte:

- 24,1: Fall und Regelung wie bei Bet-Hillel;
- 24,2: ist sie dann aus seinem Haus weggegangen, so gehe sie und gehöre einem anderen Mann;
- 24,3-4: <sup>3</sup>ist dann vom Himmel her gegen sie verkündet worden, daß der letzte Mann sie hassen und ihr eine Verstoßungsurkunde

schreiben und in ihren Machtbereich<sup>(61)</sup> geben und sie aus seinem Haus fortschicken wird, oder ist gegen ihn<sup>(62)</sup> verkündet worden, daß der letzte Mann sterben wird, der/weil er sie zur Frau genommen hat, <sup>4</sup>so hat der erste Mann, der sie am Anfang entlassen hatte, kein Recht, sie zurückzunehmen, daß sie ihm zur Frau sei, nachdem sie sich verunreinigt hat, weil sie Greuel vor YHWH ist — die Kinder, die sie von ihm gebären wird, werden aber nicht Greuel sein —; und du sollst das Land, das YHWH, euer Gott, euch als Erbe geben wird, nicht mit Peststrafe beladen.

Der Aufbau der Materie von 24,2-3 in Ps.-J. entspricht der Auffassung Bet-Hillels, obwohl die Übertragung עבירת פיתגם = ערות דבר (Übertretung eines Gebots der jüdischen Sitte) nach Bet-Hillel nur Gründe für obligatorische Ehescheidung umfaßt. Die ausdrückliche Erwähnung des göttlichen Drohwortes gegen die Partner der zweiten Ehe gehört im Fall der obligatorischen Scheidung ebenfalls zum Gedankengut Bet-Hillels<sup>(63)</sup>.

Außer den genannten Eigenheiten von Ps.-J. enthalten die Targumim dem Urtext gegenüber noch verschiedene Begriffserklärungen, die vermutlich eine lange Geschichte hinter sich haben. Im besonderen halten wir fest:

1. Für die letzte Begründung des Gesetzes (Befleckung des Landes; 24,4b) benutzt die Randlesung von Neof. im Gegensatz zu den anderen Targumim die gleiche Wurzel wie für die Unreinheit der Frau (סאב im Pael) und bringt damit wie die LXX und Jer 3,1 die zwei Begründungen in enge Beziehung.

2. Der Greuel vor YHWH als eine weitere Begründung von 24,4, wo im MT ein *Qerê/Ketib* und in der LXX eine entsprechende Doppeldeutigkeit vorliegt (תועבה הוא/היא = βδέλυγμα ἔστιν), ist mit מרחקא היא (Onq., Ps.-J.) und mit מרחקה הוא (Neof.) übertragen. Wenn es einen Zweifel gibt, worauf sich das Pronomen bezieht — auf die Frau, den ersten Mann oder die verurteilte Handlung —, so gibt der Zusatz des Ps.-J. betreffs der Kinder der gesetzeswidrig wiederaufgenommen Ehe den Ausschlag dafür, es auf Personen zu beziehen und nicht auf die verurteilte Handlung. Ps.-J. betont, daß 24,4 ausdrücklich *sie* als Greuel bezeichnet, also nicht ihre Kin-

<sup>(61)</sup> Vgl. SifDtn 269 zu 24,1.

<sup>(62)</sup> Proleptisch: gegen den letzten Mann.

<sup>(63)</sup> Vgl. oben Anm. 53.

der<sup>(64)</sup>. Die gängigen Übersetzungen des MT und der Targumim sehen die Sache aber anders: Greuel vor YHWH ist nach ihnen die verurteilte Handlung.

3. Die passive Bedeutung des hebräischen Hothpael **הִטְמֵאָה** (24,4) wird in der Übersetzung des Neof. und dessen Randglosse nuanciert wiedergegeben: "nachdem sie von einem anderen Mann (dem zweiten Gatten) verunreinigt worden ist (**אֶסְתַּאבֶּת**)" bzw. "nachdem er sie verunreinigt hat (**סֵאב** im Pael)". Dieses Verständnis spiegelt spezifisch hillelitische Exegese wider.

4. Der Begriff **עֲרִיַּת דְּבַר**, Grund für die Scheidung, wird von Neof. mit dem aramäischen Bildungslehnwort **מִלַּץ דְּמִלָּה** übersetzt und zweifellos im Sinne Bet-Hillels verstanden; von Onq. und Ps.-J. wird er als **עֲבִירַת פִּתּוּם** (Übertretung eines Gebots der jüdischen Sitte) im Sinn eines schwerwiegenden Vergehens interpretiert. Diese letztere aram. Übersetzung hat unter den Fachleuten zu verschiedenen Meinungen über den Ort von Onq. innerhalb der normativen Tradition Anlaß gegeben. Für uns handelt es sich um den Grund nur für die obligatorische Scheidung im Sinne der Lehre Bet-Hillels.

5. Die verschiedenen Worte, welche die Urkunde (MT: **סָפַר כְּרִיתָהּ**) bezeichnen oder das Fortschicken von 24,1.3.4 übersetzen, lassen entsprechende Nuancen in der Auffassung von der Ehescheidung erkennen<sup>(65)</sup>. Onq. verwendet **נָט פִּטְוֹרִין** bzw. das Verb **פָּטַר** (entlassen, befreien); Neof.: **אָגַרַת שְׂבוּקִין** bzw. drei verschiedene Verben: **שָׁלַח** (24,1 im Pael, wie MT: fortschicken), **טָרַד** (24,3: vertreiben) und **שָׁבַק** (24,4: verlassen oder gehen lassen); Ps.-J.: **סָפַר תִּירוּכִין** (תָּרַךְ; Pael: verstoßen) bzw. zwei verschiedene Verben: **נָשַׁל** (24,1.3 im Aphel: fortschicken) und **פָּטַר** (24,4: entlassen, befreien). R. Jehuda hat in seiner in der Mischna festgehaltenen Urkundenformel die drei aramäischen Wendungen, die in den Targumim zu finden sind, zusammengebracht: **סָפַר תִּירוּכִין וְאָגַרַת שְׂבוּקִין וְנָט פִּטְוֹרִין** (mGit 9,3)<sup>(66)</sup>.

<sup>(64)</sup> Diese Auslegung ist u. a. auch aus SifDtn 270; yQid 3,14 (64c); bYev 11b bekannt.

<sup>(65)</sup> Vgl. schon LXX: **βιβλίον ἀποστασίους**; Josephus: **γράμματα/γραμματεῖον**, Vg: *libellus repudii*.

<sup>(66)</sup> Eine doppelte Wendung steht in einer aramäischen Scheidungsurkunde aus dem Jahr 111 n. Chr. (Mur 19: DJD II [1960] 105,2+7=13+20): **סָפַר תִּירוּכִין וְנָט שְׂבוּקִין**; ebenso in einer griechischen Aussöhnungs-

6. Die Übersetzung von **אם לא תמצא חן בעיניו** verdient Beachtung. Onq.: **אם לא תשכח רחמין** ("wenn sie kein Erbarmen findet"); Ps.-J. ähnlich, aber im Perfekt: **אין לא השכחת רחמין** ("wenn sie kein Erbarmen gefunden hat"); Neof. ebenfalls im Perfekt: **אין לא אשכחת חן וחסד** ("wenn sie nicht Gunst und Wohlwollen gefunden hat"). Die drei Übersetzungen, vor allem diejenigen im Perfekt, lassen den Gedanken an ein mögliches Erbarmen der schuldigen Ehefrau gegenüber aufkommen. Die Haltung des Verzeihens und Sich-Aussöhnens, die Jeremia<sup>(67)</sup> hervorhebt und die das Neue Testament wiederaufnimmt, ist auch, wenigstens einer des Ehebruchs verdächtigen Frau (Sotah) gegenüber, in dem tannaitischen Midrasch SifDtn §218 bezeugt: Die "Männer von Jerusalem" gestatteten dem Ehemann, einer solchen Frau zu verzeihen. In der Exegese Raschis ist dagegen die Scheidung wegen **ערוה דבר** gerade deshalb Pflicht, "damit [die Frau] in den Augen des [Mannes] keine Gunst finde (**חן שלא תמצא חן**)"<sup>(68)</sup>.

#### Anhang: Dtn 24,1-4 bei Matthäus

Auf diese Thematik, die eine eigene umfangreiche Abhandlung verdienen würde, kann hier nur in aller Kürze eingegangen werden. Die verschiedenen oben dargelegten Lesungen des dtn Gesetzes können alle in unterschiedlichem Ausmaß zu der schwierigen und viel diskutierten Frage nach der Ehescheidung im Neuen Testament, besonders bei Matthäus, beitragen. Den entscheidenden historischen Hintergrund für die halachische Kontroverse zwischen den Pharisäern und Jesus liefert jedoch die unterschiedliche Interpretation von Dtn 24,1-4 in den Schulen Hillels und Schammais. Ein Großteil der

---

urkunde aus dem Jahr 124 n. Chr. (Mur 115: DJD II [1960] 248,4+5): ἀπαλλάγειν καὶ ἀπολύειν, was dem καταλλάξαι καὶ προσλάβεσθαι gegenübersteht.

<sup>(67)</sup> Kap. 3; vgl. dazu PesR 44,6, wo Jer 3,1 in dem Sinn gedeutet wird, daß Gott, wenn Israel Buße tut, den in Dtn 24,1-4 verhängten Beschluß aufhebt: "Wenn ein Mann seine Frau fortschickt und sie von ihm weggegangen ist und einem anderen Mann gehört hat, wird er dann wieder zu ihr zurückkehren? Würde dieses Land nicht völlig entweiht? 'Obwohl du mit vielen Liebhabern gebuhlt hast [und ich mit dir nach Dtn 24,1-4 verfahren müßte], kehre zu mir zurück!' – Spruch des Herrn".

<sup>(68)</sup> Raschi liest also den MT parenthetisch: "sonst (**אם לא**) wird sie Gunst in seinen Augen finden".

bezüglich des Neuen Testaments aufgeworfenen Probleme erhält, was die Position Jesu und die seiner Gegner betrifft, von hier sein spezifisches Gepräge<sup>(69)</sup>.

In dem als Dublette vorgelegten Logion (5,32 und 19,9) macht sich Matthäus eine dreiteilige Gliederung des dtn Gesetzes mit den entsprechenden Rechtssubjekten zu eigen:

- a. 5,32a: πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων... ποιεῖ... μοιχευθῆναι
- b. 5,32b: ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ μοιχᾶται
- c. 19,9: ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ... καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται

In dem Logion wird als indirekter bzw. direkter Ehebruch verurteilt: a) die Verstoßung (Scheidung) einer Frau; b) die Ehe mit einer verstoßenen Frau; c) eine neue Ehe des Mannes, der seine Frau verstoßen hat. Man sieht, daß Matthäus bei seinen Formulierungen dem festen Rahmen von Dtn 24,1-4 folgt und sich — was bisher kaum beachtet wurde — nicht nur auf 24,1 bezieht. Dabei setzt er eine aufgegliederte Lesung des dtn Gesetzes voraus: In 5,32a und 5,32b greift er die gesetzliche Materie von Dtn 24,1+2 und in 19,9 diejenige von 24,1+4a auf. Was dem Ganzen die Einheit gibt, ist aber in den drei Fällen die gleichlautende Verurteilung in der Apodosis.

(69) Vgl. dazu auch (H. L. STRACK)–P. BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch I* (München 1926) 303-321. Erstaunlicherweise sind selbst Fachleute für die früh-rabbinische Zeit anderer Meinung. Nach G. F. MOORE, *Judaism II* (Cambridge, MA 1927) 124-125, ist die Antwort Jesu auf die typisch hillelitische Frage von Mt 19,3 jüdischem Recht völlig fremd ("quite foreign to Jewish law"). Jesus stütze seine Antwort nur auf Gen 1,27 und 2,24 und nicht auf eine Interpretation von Dtn 24,1. Ähnlich S. BELKIN, *Philo and the Oral Law* (HSS XI; Cambridge, MA 1940) 231: Da nach Jesus im Gegensatz zur rabbinischen Interpretation nur Unzucht die Scheidung (!) rechtfertige ("only fornication justifies divorce"), kommt er zu demselben Schluß wie Moore: Jesus ignoriere Dtn 24,1 vollständig und stütze seine Antwort auf die erzählenden Stellen Gen 1,27 und 2,24. Solche und andere Fehldeutungen übersehen vor allem zwei Tatsachen: 1) Die traditionelle und normative rabbinische Interpretation von 24,1, also die hillelitische, ist in verschiedenen Punkten weder die exegetisch einzig mögliche noch die für die Zeit Jesu historisch einzig bezeugte. Bei Matthäus fällt die Position Bet-Schammais, der ebenfalls widersprochen wird, schwerer ins Gewicht als diejenige Bet-Hillels. 2) Der Jesus des Mt-Evangeliums will das gesamte dtn "Ehescheidungsgesetz" neu erörtern und verstehen, nicht nur dessen ersten Vers.

Unter dem, was die Interpretationen von Bet-Hillel und Bet-Schammai sonst zum Verständnis des Logions beitragen, seien hier die drei Begriffe ἀπολύειν, λόγος πορνείας, παρεκτός bzw. μὴ ἐπὶ kurz angesprochen:

1. Das Verb ἀπολύειν dürfte das bezeichnen, was Bet-Schammai in der ersten Apodosis nicht nur mit שלח (Piël), sondern auch mit נאצ ausdrückt. Letzteres Verb bezeichnet im Hiphil die Verstoßung seitens des Mannes mit ihrer unmittelbaren Rechtsfolge und im Qal das Fortgehen der verstoßenen Frau.

2. Was die Wortfolge des Ausdrucks λόγος πορνείας (Mt 5,32a) betrifft, so begegnen wir ihr in der vielleicht auf Bet-Schammai zurückgehenden Lesart ערה בדבר von mGit 9,10<sup>(70)</sup>. Inhaltlich dürfte λόγος πορνείας ebenso wie ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ (Mt 19,9a) mit der schammaitischen Auslegung ערה בדבר (durch Zeugen bestätigte ערה) in Verbindung zu bringen sein<sup>(71)</sup>; wegen des in Richtung auf Ehebruch erweiterten Verständnisses von ערה dürfte als Übersetzung "Rechtssache Unzucht" zutreffen.

3. Die viel diskutierte "Ausnahmepartikel" des Logions (παρεκτός bzw. μὴ ἐπὶ) wird durch die oben zitierte Mischna und Baraita<sup>(72)</sup> erhellt. לא יגרש...אלא אם כן ("darf nicht verstoßen, außer wenn"; mGit 9,10) legt es nahe, die Partikel im Sinn einer Ausnahme zu verstehen ("außer im Rechtsfall von πορνεία"). ולא נאמר ("und nicht auch ... gesagt wäre"; so zweimal in der Baraita)

<sup>(70)</sup> Vgl. Anm. 24.

<sup>(71)</sup> Vgl. oben S. 368-370. Zu verschiedenen Versuchen, die ערה /πορνεία bei Matthäus konkret zu verstehen, vgl. U. LUZ, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (EKKNT I,1; 1985) 274 mit Anmerkungen. Die Frage, ob sich der Mann im Fall von λόγος πορνείας auf seiten seiner Frau von ihr trennen darf oder soll, bleibt unbeantwortet. Was die Situation getrennter Ehepartner betrifft, so ist 1 Kor 7,11 — die Gliederung des Logions läßt deutlich erkennen, daß es sich an beiden Stellen um dieselbe Lehre handelt — klarer als das Logion: entweder sollen sie unverheiratet bleiben oder sich versöhnen. Verschiedene Exegeten (z. B. J. A. FITZMYER, *To advance the Gospel* [New York 1981] 88-89) wollen immer noch unter πορνεία eine wegen Blutsverwandschaft verbotene eheliche Beziehung (vgl. Lev 18,6-18) verstehen. Sie übersehen dabei, daß sich die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Jesus und den Pharisäern auf Dtn 24,1-4 bezieht und daß in diesem Zusammenhang weder in den Schulen Hillels und Schammais noch überhaupt in der gesamten rabbinischen Literatur eine solche Interpretation von ערה anzutreffen ist.

<sup>72</sup> S. 362.

könnte die von M.-J. Lagrange und anderen für Mt 5,32a vorgeschlagene "präteritive" Deutung ("es wird hier nicht über den Rechtsfall πορνεία gesprochen") begünstigen. Beide Wendungen sind Merkmale der sogenannten restriktiven Exegese Bet-Schammai.

Päpstliches Bibelinstitut  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Rom

Reinhard NEUDECKER

### SOMMAIRE

Cette étude commence par présenter brièvement l'exégèse commune de Dt 24,1-4 dans l'exégèse moderne. Ce texte traite d'un cas juridique plutôt inhabituel et ne contient à proprement parler aucune loi sur le divorce. La première partie de l'article analyse les lectures ou paraphrases de la LXX, de Philon et de Josèphe. La seconde partie examine comment le texte a été compris dans les écoles de Hillel et Shammaï. L'étude détaillée des sources fait aussi apparaître une position presque complètement oubliée et que l'on attribue ici à l'école de Shammaï, en l'occurrence l'interdiction d'épouser une femme renvoyée à cause d'un *'erwat dābār*. L'appendice montre clairement que les interprétations des écoles de Hillel et Shammaï fournissent l'arrière-fond indispensable à la compréhension des affirmations néotestamentaires sur le divorce.

# ANIMADVERSIONES

## Hebrews 10,30-31: A Suggestion

Heb 10,30-31 are two verses about which a certain consensus seems to have been formed among current commentators on the epistle. The consensus is that all of the thought in the two verses represents the negative aspects of God's judgment. Four commentators — W. L. Lane, H. W. Attridge, H.-F. Weiß, and N. Casalini — will be cited here as examples of this consensus<sup>(1)</sup>. The present note will argue that the consensus is mistaken, and that a different interpretation — that part of the thought represents the positive aspects of God's judgment — opens the way for helpful insights into the thought of the epistle<sup>(2)</sup>.

Heb 10,30-31 is as follows:

- 30 οἶδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα·  
ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω.  
καὶ πάλιν·  
κρινεῖ κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.  
31 φοβερόν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας θεοῦ ζῶντος<sup>(3)</sup>.

Lane translates:

- 30 For we know who it was who said.  
“Vengeance belongs to me; I will repay”;  
and again.  
“The Lord will judge his people”.  
31 It is terrifying to fall into the hands of the living God<sup>(4)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> W. L. LANE, *Hebrews 9–13* (Word Biblical Commentary 48B; Dallas 1991); H. W. ATTRIDGE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1989); H.-F. WEISS, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (MeyerK; Göttingen 151991); N. CASALINI, *Agli Ebrei. Discorso di esortazione* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Analecta 34; Jerusalem 1992).

<sup>(2)</sup> This modern consensus does not reflect all past interpretation. F. J. Delitzsch, for example, in 1857 thought that the two citations in v. 30 were negative and positive in their original context and in Hebrews. Cf. below, n. 21.

<sup>(3)</sup> Text and arrangement after *NA*<sup>26</sup>. There are no textual variants which seem to be relevant for the purposes of the present study.

<sup>(4)</sup> Translation after LANE, *Hebrews 9–13*, 274.



V. 30a ("Vengeance belongs to me; I will repay") is taken from Deut 32,35a, and depicts God's attitude of punishment. Lane comments: "Using the emphatic first person singular, God declares that he assumes personal responsibility for taking vengeance on those who have become his adversaries<sup>(6)</sup>. Lane is undoubtedly correct in this evaluation, which is contested by no one.

The difficulty comes from the interpretation of the following part of the text, vv. 30b-31: "'The Lord will judge his people'. It is terrifying to fall into the hands of the living God". The four authors argue that these words are of a piece with the undoubtedly negative citation of Deut 32,35a<sup>(6)</sup>. Lane interprets the words "The Lord will judge his people" in v. 30b as implying "the certainty of the judgment of the apostates", and gives v. 30b the same sense as v. 30a: "The two quotations in v. 30 serve to reinforce the reference to the inevitability of judgment in v. 27a"<sup>(7)</sup>. He goes on to interpret v. 31 in the same way: "The sober comment in v. 31 provides a climactic to the entire argument. The initial φοβερόν, 'it is terrifying', which is emphatic by virtue of its position, sounds again the note of terror (φοβρά) in v. 27. These correlative terms evoke the numinous religious dread that the thought of the imminent judgment of God inspires in those who have forfeited the benefits of Christ's sacrifice"<sup>(8)</sup>. The other three authors agree<sup>(9)</sup>.

On the surface this consensus position seems to be the obvious interpretation, for the word φοβερός and the phrase τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας θεοῦ ζῶντος seem to corroborate each other in suggesting the negative consequences of the judgment apparently alluded to in the previous words at the end of v. 30: κρινεῖ κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. And all this seems of a piece with the citation in the first part of v. 30: ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, which is undoubtedly negative.

But on closer examination some difficulties appear in this interpretation which gives a negative cast to the entire passage. The citation "The Lord will judge his people" has a positive connotation in its original context at Deut 32,36a and a parallel use at Ps 134,14a<sup>(10)</sup>. And the phrase "to

<sup>(6)</sup> LANE, *Hebrews 9-13*, 295. Paul cites this same text at Rom 12,19, where it is used to invoke the vengeance of God. The Greek text cited is not the Septuagint, but a Greek textual tradition more in line with the Massoretic text. This fact seems irrelevant for present purposes. Cf. LANE, *Hebrews 9-13*, 295.

<sup>(7)</sup> Deut 32,35a: ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδίκησεως ἀνταποδώσω — "Vengeance is mine, I will pay them back" (translation after *The New Jerusalem Bible* [London 1985]).

<sup>(8)</sup> LANE, *Hebrews 9-13*, 295.

<sup>(9)</sup> LANE, *Hebrews 9-13*, 295-296.

<sup>(10)</sup> ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 296, WEIB, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 541-542, and CASALINI, *Agli Ebrei*, 306. K.J. THOMAS, "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews", *NTS* 11 (1964-1965) 315, n. 5, speaks of "the plain sense of the context".

<sup>(10)</sup> This positive connotation in the original context in the Septuagint is recognized by Lane: "The thought prominent both in Deut 32:36a and in Ps 134:14a LXX is that God's judgment will result in the vindication of his people" (LANE, *Hebrews 9-13*, 295). In the same vein ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 296, WEIB, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 541-542, and CASALINI, *Agli Ebrei*, 306. O. Kuß gives a good rendering of Deut 32,36a in its Old Testament context: "'Dann schafft der Herr seinem

fall into the hands of someone" in the biblical tradition has some positive connotation<sup>(11)</sup>. The main reason why the phrase is construed in a negative sense seems to be the word φοβερός. It is assumed that the word means "terrifying" or "inspiring terror", "dreadful", not only because the same word seems to have this meaning in 10,27, but also because this is the ordinary meaning given in dictionaries<sup>(12)</sup>.

The meaning of φοβερός in the sense of "terrifying" thus seems assured, both by reason of context and by reason of conventional interpretation. But this view can be challenged by a careful examination of the word φοβερός in the Septuagint. There the word has two meanings, "terrifying" and "awesome". It would be beyond the scope of this note to make a detailed lexicographical study of φοβερός in the Septuagint. But enough evidence can be marshalled to substantiate the claim of a twofold meaning.

In the Septuagint φοβερός is used to translate the Hebrew words נִפָּל, לִיָּהּ, אֲרָץ in the nifal, and אֲרָץ. By far the greatest number of translations is of the nifal of אֲרָץ<sup>(13)</sup>. Some of the uses of the nifal of אֲרָץ seem designed to convey the meaning "terrible", i.e., inspiring terror. For example, at Deut 8,15 the word is used to describe the "desert", and the following description suggests the meaning "inspiring terror", "terrible": "...[God] led you through the great and terrible desert [διὰ τῆς ἐρήμου τῆς μεγάλης καὶ φοβεῖας] with its venomous serpents and scorpions and thirsty waterless ground"<sup>(14)</sup>. The context indicates that "inspiring terror", "terrible" is the meaning. So also Deut

---

Volke Recht und zeigt seinen Knechten Erbarmen'" (O. Kuß, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* [RNT 8/1; Regensburg 1966] 158). Cf. below, p.393, n.22, for further discussion of this translation.

<sup>(11)</sup> This is noted by ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 296. He cites 2 Sam 24,14 and Sir 2,18, where the reference is to falling into God's hands. He cites 2 Macc 6,26 and 7,31 as examples of the use of the "hands of God" in a negative sense, but these texts are not exactly parallel with the phrase "to fall into the hands of God" (ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας θεοῦ). In Hebrews the word "living" (ζῶν) seems to be used of God in both positive and negative contexts as regards judgment. Cf. 9,14 and 3,12.

<sup>(12)</sup> Heb 10,27 reads as follows: φοβερά δέ τις ἐκδοχή κρίσεως καὶ πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθιεῖν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους — "There is left only the dreadful prospect of judgement and of the fiery wrath that is to devour your enemies" (translation after *The New Jerusalem Bible*). So also LANE, *Hebrews* 9-13, 295-296: "The initial term φοβερόν, 'it is terrifying', which is emphatic by virtue of its position, sounds again the note of terror (φοβερά) in v.27. These correlative terms evoke the numinous religious dread that the thought of the imminent judgment of God inspires in those who have forfeited the benefits of Christ's sacrifice. The final statement thus affirms the magnitude of the sin of apostasy and of the impending judgment from which there is no escape. It reflects a profound conviction of the awesome majesty and holiness of the living God..." Cf. also the meanings given in W. BAUER, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (Hrsg. K. ALAND-B. ALAND) (Berlin-New York 1988) col. 1719, "φοβερός, ἄ, ὄν": "Furcht einflößend, furchtbar, schrecklich".

<sup>(13)</sup> Source: E. HATCH-H. A. REDPATH, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* (Graz 1954 [Oxford 1897]) II, 1435.

<sup>(14)</sup> Translation after *The Complete Bible: An American Translation* (translated by J.M.P. Smith, E.J. Goodspeed et alii) (Chicago 1939 [15th impression, 1951]). The translation of Deuteronomy is attributed to T.J. Meek.

1,19 and 2,7, where the same expression, "great and terrible", is used of the desert. But at Gen 28,17 Jacob awakes from his dream and calls the place "awesome": "What an awesome place this is! [Ὡς φοβερός ὁ τόπος οὗτος]"<sup>(15)</sup>. The meaning "awesome" for φοβερός seems indicated also by the parallel at Exod 3,5, where the word ἅγιος is used to describe the place [τόπος] of the burning bush<sup>(16)</sup>. In a number of other places the divinity is described as "awesome" (κτῆ, φοβερός). So, for example, Pss 47[46],3; 76[75],8.13; 89[88],8; 96[95],4 [= 1 Chron 16,25]<sup>(17)</sup>.

This brief investigation into the Septuagint indicates that the word φοβερός is patient of another meaning besides "inspiring terror", "terrible". That meaning is "awesome", and it is appropriate when the divinity is explicitly invoked<sup>(18)</sup>. Thus it would seem appropriate to translate φοβερός at Heb 10,31 as "awesome" since there is question of "falling into the hands of the living God", i.e., God is explicitly invoked<sup>(19)</sup>. One could even make a case out for the translation "awesome" involving the use of φοβερός in Heb 12,21, where the text reads καί, οὕτω φοβερόν ἦν τὸ φανταζόμενον, Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν· ἐκφοβός εἰμι καὶ ἔντρομος. The word ἔντρομος is found at Acts 7,32 to describe the attitude of Moses at the burning bush, and at Acts 16,29 to describe the jailer of Paul and Silas at Philippi. If the meaning "in awe" for the latter text may be forced, it certainly would not be in Acts. At Heb 10,27 the connotation of awe could well be present, even though the main emphasis seems to be on brute fear.

All the above evidence seems best interpreted by assuming a bipolar meaning for φοβερός, "fear" (negative) and "awe" (positive). And this would seem to correspond to the genuinely human reaction of a believer before the mystery of God, the places associated with his cult, and his judgments — a gamut of emotions running from raw terror to solemn wonder. The emphasis can shift to one pole or the other depending on the context<sup>(20)</sup>. The interpretation being questioned here assumes that the

<sup>(15)</sup> *The Complete Bible*, ad. loc. Translation by T. J. Meek.

<sup>(16)</sup> "Zwischen Heiligkeit und numinoser Furcht besteht eine innere Korrespondenz und Entsprechung, die sich an verschiedenen Stellen aufzeigen läßt: Ein Vergleich von Gen 28,17 und Ex 3,5 erweist *qādōš* und *nōrā* als Synonyme, insofern in beiden Kontexten *jr* als Ausdruck numinoser Furcht begegnet" (H. F. Fuhs, *TWAT*, III, col. 879).

<sup>(17)</sup> Cf. Fuhs, *TWAT* III, col. 879, for these and other examples involving the Hebrew text. At Ps 68[67],36 κτῆ is translated by θαυμαστός instead of φοβερός.

<sup>(18)</sup> Cf. the meaning "inspiring fear, awe" given in KB (1958), 400: the two aspects of "fear" and "awe" are combined. Cf. also the mention of the "awesome majesty and holiness of God" in the citation from Lane given above in n. 12.

<sup>(19)</sup> At 12,28 the addressees are urged to worship God μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους. ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 383, comments: "The final characterization of the recommended worship 'with reverent awe' (μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους). 'Reverence' is the same attitude displayed by Jesus in his supplication to the God who could save him, but is intensified by the latter term, 'which is a good classical word, uncommon in scripture'. This text is witness to the fact that the idea was present in the mind of the author of Hebrews, independent of interpretations elsewhere in the epistle.

<sup>(20)</sup> Note the positive expectation explicitly mentioned in connection with the κρίσις of God at 1 John 4,17: Ἐν τούτῳ τετελείωται ἡ ἀγάπη μεθ' ἡμῶν, ἵνα

negative pole is being emphasized at Heb 10,31 as it is at 10,27. But given the positive nature of the citations/allusions from the Septuagint at vv. 30b and 31 in their original context, the emphasis would better be placed on the positive pole.

Once φοβερός is viewed as having a potentially positive meaning, there is no reason for not attributing a positive meaning to the whole of 10,31, for this would be in accord with the meaning of the citation in its original Old Testament context. And once v.31 is viewed as being positive, there is no reason for not viewing 10,30b the same way, for again, this is the meaning of the citation in its original Old Testament context<sup>(21)</sup>.

When the Septuagint quotations/allusions in 10,30b-31 are viewed as being positive and not negative, they are seen to belong to what follows (vv. 32-39) and not to what precedes (vv. 26-30a). The word πάλιν would then be more intelligible as an appropriate insertion in the middle of two successive verses in the Septuagint, Deut 32,35 and 32,36, in order to indicate that they have different functions in Hebrews. The meaning "again" refers to the parallelism between the two citations from the Septuagint insofar as they are each citations, not insofar as they each have a negative content.

As a result of this interpretation of Heb 10,30-31, then, Heb 10,26-30a are negative, and Heb 10,30b-39 are positive. Vv. 30b-31 introduce the positive section, giving it an explicit eschatological coloring. More to the point, this eschatological coloring is positive: God "judging" his people (v.30b) and their "falling into his hands" (v.31) are aspects of salvation, and the citation of Deut 32,36 links all that follows with this positive view of κρίνειν/κρίσις in the Old Testament<sup>(22)</sup>.

---

παρρησίαν ἔχωμεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως, ὅτι καθὼς ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔσμεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ, φόβος οὐκ ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ.

<sup>(21)</sup> F. J. DELITZSCH, *Der Hebräerbrief* (Leipzig 1857; Nachdruck Gießen 1989) 500, interpreted the meaning of Deut 32,36 in the Septuagint as positive, and held that the citation in Heb 10,30b was also positive. He recognized that the verb κρίνειν in the Septuagint was not always negative: "Die LXX gebraucht κρίνειν keineswegs bloß im Sinne strafrichterlich Erkennens, sondern auch hülffreicher Entscheidung zu Jemandes Gunsten (z.B. Ps. 54,3 κρίνον με s.v.a. sonst κρίνον τὴν κρίσιν μου) und nicht bloß sachwaltenden, sonder überhaupt verwaltenden Waltens (z.B. Ps. 72,2 κρίνειν τὸν λαὸν σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ)" (ibid.). But he dilutes the effect of this interpretation in Hebrews by taking 10,31 in a negative sense (ibid.).

<sup>(22)</sup> For κρίνειν cf. F. BÜCHSEL, *TWNT*, III, 921: "Die Septuaginta übersetzen mit κρίνειν weit überwiegend Worte der Rechtssprache... κρίνειν bezeichnet demgemäß das Richten und das gerade auch dann, wenn es dem Bedrängten Rettung, Heil schafft, z.B. ψ 71,2: κρίνειν τὸν λαὸν σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς σου ἐν κρίσει. Sach 7,9: κρίμα δίκαιον κρίνατε καὶ ἔλεος οἰκτιρμὸν ποιεῖτε". (Cf. also the interpretation of Delitzsch given above in n.21). For κρίσις cf. id., *TWNT* III, 943: "Die Septuaginta gebraucht κρίσις häufig, in den meisten Fällen zur Übersetzung von ὑψηλ... Damit kommt κρίσις zu der Bedeutung: *das Recht*, besonders: das des Unterdrückten, das der Richter zur Geltung, zur Durchsetzung bringt. κρίσις ist dan Parallele zu ἔλεος ψ 100 (101), 1: ἔλεος καὶ κρίσιν ἴσσομαι, zu ἐλεημοσύνη ψ 32 (33), 5: ἀγαπᾷ ἐλεημοσύνην καὶ κρίσιν, zu ἀλήθεια ψ 110 (111), 7: ἔργα χειρῶν αὐτοῦ ἀλήθεια καὶ κρίσις. Aus diesem Sprachgebrauch der LXX erklärt sich der neutestamentliche von Mt 23,23: ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸ ἔλεος καὶ τὴν πίστιν,

The perspective created by this shift of connotation also creates different presuppositions for judging the force of κρίσις in Heb 9,27: instead of being negative and out of place in the context<sup>(23)</sup>, it is better taken as positive, thus fitting into the idea of σωτηρία expressed in the following verse. In Hebrews κρίσις can be positive (9,27)<sup>(24)</sup> or negative (10,27), just as κρίνω can be positive (10,30b) or negative (13,4).

The authoritative connotations of the use of κρίνειν at 10,30b should also be noted. These authoritative connotations follow if the meaning is in accord with the Septuagint usage<sup>(25)</sup>; God is acting as the Judge vindicating his people. This authoritative tone is important for evaluating the perspective of the positive section 10,30b-39.

Finally, the interpretation which sees the Septuagint citations at Heb 10,30-31 as mirroring their meaning in the original Old Testament context would help in the general evaluation of the use of the Septuagint in the New Testament in general and in Hebrews in particular. Two of the more prominent studies of the use of the Old Testament citations in Hebrews would thus be in need of correction<sup>(26)</sup>.

The present paper has argued for a change in a certain contemporary consensus in the interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews. According to this consensus Heb 10,30-31 should be taken in an exclusively negative sense, as the summation of the negative paraenesis in Heb 10,19-29. The

---

Lk 11,42: παρέρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ". Behind this terminology, of course, are the Semitic cultural patterns underlying the use of the word "to judge", patterns helpfully summarized by M. O'CONNOR, "Judges", in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (ed. R.E. BROWN-J.A. FITZMYER-R.E. MURPHY) (Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1990) §8:1 (p.135): "Key terms [sc., in the Book of Judges] are those from the root *šāpaṭ*, which means not 'to judge' in the usual restricted sense of exercising juridical authority, but 'to rule'.... The *šāpaṭ* vocabulary 'refers not to a judicial act of an officer in a court of law, but to an authoritative administrative edict of a person who exercises' social control with which she or he has been charged 'by competent political or social authority' (Mendenhall, *Tenth Generation*)". Words from the root *šāpaṭ* often stand behind the use of the Greek κρίνειν in the Septuagint. In Deut 32,36 the Hebrew root is *dīn*, which is closely related to *šāpaṭ* (cf. V. HAMP, art. "דן", *TWAT* II, col. 201; with regard to Deut 32,36 Hamp states: "Sein [i.e., God's] Volk Israel wird gerichtet, und zwar helfend..." [col. 204]).

(<sup>23</sup>) Two examples of authors who regard κρίσις as negative and therefore a cause of incompatibility in the context: "This bit of proverbial wisdom seems somewhat out of place in this context..." (ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 265). "Denen jedenfalls, die ihn standhaft im Glauben erwarten, wird er zur σωτηρία erscheinen, nicht also εἰς κρίσιν" (WEIß, *Der brief an die Hebräer*, 496).

(<sup>24</sup>) Cf. Luke 11,42, where the κρίσις of God is in parallel with his ἀγάπη. This seems to be an instance of the common Septuagint usage of κρίσις in the sense of the right of the oppressed to be vindicated. Cf. F. BÜCHSEL, *TWNT* III, 943.

(<sup>25</sup>) Cf. above, p. 393, n. 22.

(<sup>26</sup>) F. SCHRÖGER, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger* (Biblische Untersuchungen 4; Regensburg 1968) 181, takes the two citations in Heb 10,30 as both being negative in their original context in the Septuagint text of Deuteronomy, and negative as well in Hebrews. He is taken to task by CASALINI, *Agli Ebrei*, 349, n.325, for not seeing that the two citations in their original context are negative and positive. K.L. THOMAS, "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews", 315, distinguishes between the negative and positive connotations of the original contexts, but says they are both negative in Hebrews.

change being advocated in the present note is that the negative sense should stop with the citation of Deut 32,35 at Heb 10,30a, and that the following citation, from Deut 32,36, at 10,30b, and the verse 10,31, should be interpreted in a positive sense, as an introduction to the positive paraenesis ending at 10,39. Such a change clarifies the positive paraenesis by indicating that it is eschatological and legal: God in the end-time is vindicating his people. This interpretation is helpful for interpreting other passages in Hebrews and for gaining a more accurate view of the use of Septuagint citations in the epistle.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Rome

James SWETNAM, SJ

## Greek Qumran Fragment 7Q5: Possibilities and Impossibilities

The Greek scroll fragments from Qumran present a curious phenomenon: whereas the one Greek Old Testament papyrus from Cave 4 (supplemented by four Greek parchment scraps and one Exodus paraphrase on papyrus from the same cave) does not appear to belong to a separate collection, but to a general, motley "library" preserved in that cave, the neighbouring cave 7 includes a collection in its own right — nothing but nineteen Greek fragments, eighteen of them on papyrus, and another one preserved as an imprint in the hardened soil of the cave. A few months ago, the international scholarly debate about this cave has been given a new twist. Vittoria Spottorno, the new editor of the Spanish journal *Sefarad*, has published an article which claims to shed new light on the most important Greek papyrus fragment from Cave 7, "7Q5". In it, she proposes "una nueva posible identificación de 7Q5", Zechariah 7,4-5<sup>(1)</sup>.

Her paper appeared a couple of months after the publication of the Eichstätt University Qumran symposium, "Christen und Christliches in Qumran?"<sup>(2)</sup>. At Eichstätt, it had become apparent that there are more

(<sup>1</sup>) V. SPOTTORNO, "Una nueva posible identificación de 7Q5", *Sefarad* 52 (1992) 541-543. Correctly, however, her suggestion involves 7,3b-5.

(<sup>2</sup>) B. MAYER (Hrsg.), *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* (Regensburg 1992). This volume contains the most up-to-date photographs of Qumran fragment 7Q5 on p. 41, 242 and 243 (enlargement of *nu* detail, cf. n. 5). Photographs of 7Q5 can also be found in *Bib* 53 (1972), J. O'Callaghan, *Los papiros griegos de la cueva 7 de Qumrán* (as in n. 13), and in C. P. THIEDE, *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript? Qumran Fragment 7Q5 and Its Significance for New Testament Studies* (as in n. 8). The first published photograph of 7Q5 was part of the original DJD III edition (cf. n. 7), vol. 2, *Planches*, planche XXX, no. 5.

change being advocated in the present note is that the negative sense should stop with the citation of Deut 32,35 at Heb 10,30a, and that the following citation, from Deut 32,36, at 10,30b, and the verse 10,31, should be interpreted in a positive sense, as an introduction to the positive paraenesis ending at 10,39. Such a change clarifies the positive paraenesis by indicating that it is eschatological and legal: God in the end-time is vindicating his people. This interpretation is helpful for interpreting other passages in Hebrews and for gaining a more accurate view of the use of Septuagint citations in the epistle.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Rome

James SWETNAM, SJ

## Greek Qumran Fragment 7Q5: Possibilities and Impossibilities

The Greek scroll fragments from Qumran present a curious phenomenon: whereas the one Greek Old Testament papyrus from Cave 4 (supplemented by four Greek parchment scraps and one Exodus paraphrase on papyrus from the same cave) does not appear to belong to a separate collection, but to a general, motley "library" preserved in that cave, the neighbouring cave 7 includes a collection in its own right — nothing but nineteen Greek fragments, eighteen of them on papyrus, and another one preserved as an imprint in the hardened soil of the cave. A few months ago, the international scholarly debate about this cave has been given a new twist. Vittoria Spottorno, the new editor of the Spanish journal *Sefarad*, has published an article which claims to shed new light on the most important Greek papyrus fragment from Cave 7, "7Q5". In it, she proposes "una nueva posible identificación de 7Q5", Zechariah 7,4-5<sup>(1)</sup>.

Her paper appeared a couple of months after the publication of the Eichstätt University Qumran symposium, "Christen und Christliches in Qumran?"<sup>(2)</sup>. At Eichstätt, it had become apparent that there are more

(<sup>1</sup>) V. SPOTTORNO, "Una nueva posible identificación de 7Q5", *Sefarad* 52 (1992) 541-543. Correctly, however, her suggestion involves 7,3b-5.

(<sup>2</sup>) B. MAYER (Hrsg.), *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* (Regensburg 1992). This volume contains the most up-to-date photographs of Qumran fragment 7Q5 on p. 41, 242 and 243 (enlargement of *nu* detail, cf. n. 5). Photographs of 7Q5 can also be found in *Bib* 53 (1972), J. O'Callaghan, *Los papiros griegos de la cueva 7 de Qumrán* (as in n. 13), and in C. P. THIEDE, *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript? Qumran Fragment 7Q5 and Its Significance for New Testament Studies* (as in n. 8). The first published photograph of 7Q5 was part of the original DJD III edition (cf. n. 7), vol. 2, *Planches*, planche XXX, no. 5.

arguments in favour of the identification of 7Q5 as Mark 6,52-53 — a *New Testament* identification first suggested as long ago as 1972 by the Spanish papyrologist José O'Callaghan<sup>(3)</sup> — than had previously been supposed by a majority of scholars. Above all, it was the detailed analysis presented by the Vienna papyrologist Herbert Hunger in favour of the Marcan identification which did not fail to impress the participants<sup>(4)</sup>. As an aftermath of the symposium, fragment 7Q5 was analyzed in the forensic laboratory of the Department of Investigations at the Israel National Police in Jerusalem. The upper remnant of a decisive diagonal stroke could be made visible in line 2 and further contributed to the solidity of the Marcan identification<sup>(5)</sup>.

It is thus highly likely that 7Q5 = Mark 6,52-53 will have to be added to the official list of New Testament papyri sooner or later. On the other hand, attempts to suggest alternative identifications remain legitimate, even if — or perhaps especially when — they are carried out in ignorance of the results obtained at Eichstätt and Jerusalem. To try and find an Old Testament (LXX) passage for 7Q5 is neither new nor original<sup>(6)</sup>, not least in view of the fact that a fragment from Exodus (7Q1 = Exod 29,4-7) and one from the deuterocanonical Letter of Jeremiah (7Q2 = EpistJer 43-44) — two texts of some importance to early Christianity — had already been identified among the 7Q papyri<sup>(7)</sup>.

It is, however, not only Hunger's paper and the forensic analysis in Jerusalem that have recently added to the arguments in favour of 7Q5 = Mark 6,52-53; O'Callaghan's identification was checked by the *Ibykus* computer programme with the result that there is no other text than Mark 6,52-53 in extant Greek literature which fits the papyrological evidence of 7Q5<sup>(8)</sup>. Any alternative suggestion must therefore be expected to come up with corrections or improvements of at least equal value and importance as those represented by the Marcan "status quo". As this tiny scroll fragment offers a mere twenty letters on five lines<sup>(9)</sup>, the scope for convincing alternative readings is understandably limited.

(3) J. O'CALLAGHAN, "Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumrán?", *Bib* 53 (1972) 91-100. Authorized English translation by W.L. Holladay: *JBL* 91 (1972) Supplement, 1-14.

(4) H. HUNGER, "7Q5: Markus 6,52-53 — oder? Die Meinung des Papyrologen", *Christen und Christliches*, 33-56, with 22 ill.

(5) C.P. THIEDE, "Bericht über die kriminaltechnische Untersuchung des Fragments 7Q5 in Jerusalem", *Christen und Christliches*, 239-245, with 4 ill.

(6) Detailed documentation and analysis in F. ROHRHIRSCH, *Markus in Qumran? Eine Auseinandersetzung mit den Argumenten für und gegen das Fragment 7Q5 mit Hilfe des methodischen Fallibilismusprinzips* (Wuppertal-Zürich 1990) 106-128.

(7) *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrán* (éd. M. BAILLET-J.T. MILIK-R. DE VAUX, OP) (DJD III; Oxford 1962) 142-146.

(8) Cf. C.P. THIEDE, *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript? The Qumran Papyrus 7Q5 And Its Significance for New Testament Studies* (Exeter-Carlisle 1992) 40-41, n. 31.

(9) For the sake of comparison: 7Q5 = EpistJer 43-44 has twenty-two letters on five lines; Masada fragment 721a = Virgil, *Aeneid* 4:9, has fifteen letters on one line.



A juxtaposition of the *editio princeps*, O'Callaghan's reading and Spottorno's alternative highlights the problem:

<i>Editio princeps</i>	O'Callaghan	Spottorno
]·[	]ε[	]τ[
]τϞ α·[	]υτωγη[	]εγωνε[
]η και τω[	]η καιτι[	]ς καιπ[
ἐγέ]γνησ[εν	]γνησ[	]γνησ[
]θηεσ[	]θησα[	]θηεγ[
		]ε[

O'Callaghan's dot underneath the *nu* in line 2 may now be deleted; the Jerusalem analysis proved its existence beyond the shadow of a doubt. However, this *nu* is not part of Spottorno's suggestions, anyway.

The extremely damaged letter in line 1 was not even tentatively identified in the *editio princeps*<sup>(10)</sup>, even though the working hypothesis of an *epsilon* was admitted. On the other hand, it cannot possibly be a *tau*. This is obvious from a comparison with the undamaged *tau* in lines 2 and 3. Should one want to look for an alternative to *epsilon* in line 1, it might just conceivably be *sigma*.

It is thus equally impossible to read *gamma* instead of *tau* in line 2. The *tau* of 7Q5 is above suspicion and has been so as early as in the *editio princeps*. The first and last letters of this line are severely damaged; even so, O'Callaghan's *upsilon* had been accepted as a possibility by the original editor<sup>(11)</sup>. The *eta*, on the other hand, has gained further plausibility by the forensic analysis in Jerusalem<sup>(12)</sup>. Therefore, Spottorno's variants are highly unlikely, if not downright impossible.

As for line 3, both O'Callaghan and Spottorno read *kai* after a *spatium*, i.e., paratactically. O'Callaghan's *eta* is confirmed by the *editio princeps* and indeed by all published enlargements, including an infra-red photograph<sup>(13)</sup>. By definition, Spottorno's *sigma* must be ruled out as impossible. Prior to Spottorno, only Aland had thought of reading *pi* instead of *tau* + ... at the end of this line<sup>(14)</sup>, but without any serious argument in its favour.

In line 4, there are no differences suggested by Spottorno; however, she wants to find a justification for her reading of *ea]n nēs[teúsēte* (as in Zech 7,5) by seeing "las dos v de línea 4" as "discontinuas". Fragment 7Q5 does in fact offer two exceptions to the rule of *scriptio continua*; they indicate indeed small gaps between words — in line 2 (*autōn hē* of Mark

<sup>(10)</sup> *DJD* III, 144.

<sup>(11)</sup> O'CALLAGHAN, *Los papiros griegos*.

<sup>(12)</sup> THIEDE, "Bericht", 240.

<sup>(13)</sup> J. O'CALLAGHAN, *Los Papiros griegos de la Cueva 7 de Qumrân* (Madrid 1974) infra-red enlargement of 7Q5 on plate VI, infra-red photographs of other 7Q-fragments on plates IV and V.

<sup>(14)</sup> K. ALAND, "Neue neutestamentliche Papyri III", *NTS* 20 (1974) 357-381, here 375.

6,52) and in line 3 (*kai ti* ... of Mark 6,53). That small gap in line 3 is part of the undamaged centre of the fragment; thus it can be compared accurately to the writing of the two *nu* in line 4. It should be obvious to the naked eye, even without the analysis of enlargements, that the "gap" between the two *nu* in line 4 is anything but a proper spacing. Otherwise, even the undisputed *kai* in line 3 could not be a *kai*, since the "space" between *kappa* and *alpha* is as wide as, if not wider than, that between the two *nu*.

In line 5, O'Callaghan and Spottorno have only one letter in common, the second one, *eta*. It might just be possible to admit Spottorno's *omega* as a remote alternative, even though no one, beginning with the *editio princeps*, has ever seen it here before. *Sigma* instead of *epsilon* for the third letter was one of two possibilities suggested in the *editio princeps*; the remnants appear to belong to a curvature, however, and would be much too high for the horizontal stroke of an *eta*. As for the practically invisible trace of the last letter in this line, it is severely damaged by a turning to the right of the papyrus, probably caused by an early attempt at destruction<sup>(15)</sup>. It is hardly possible to suggest, let alone identify any letter at all. Personally, I should have preferred a mere dot, but O'Callaghan's *alpha* (contrary to the *sigma* of the *editio princeps*) is supported by a concrete textual suggestion, Mark 6,52-53. Thus, if the papyrological and palaeographical evidence of the complete fragment supports the identification, as seems to be the case especially after Eichstätt and Jerusalem, it must be allowed to stand. In principle, the same would be true, needless to say, of Spottorno's *nu*; but, as we have seen, her alternative identification is doomed already on the basis of irrefutable evidence against other letters of her reading. Furthermore, she adds a sixth line to the fragment and sees an *epsilon* in it. Original as this addition may be, it is hampered by the papyrus itself: there simply is not enough extant material to allow for a sixth line, let alone for a letter — any letter — in it.

As we have seen, Spottorno's alternative identification is ruled out by insurmountable palaeographical barriers. There may be scope for debate in one or two secondary cases, but decisive letters pass an unequivocal verdict on her attempt.

All this is further corroborated by a look at the actual passage which she suggests in place of Mark 6,52-53, Zech 7,4-5, and which should be, as we have seen, according to the text of her own reconstruction, 7,3b-5. To begin with, there would be no justification for the undoubted and undoubted paratactical *kai* after a *spatium*. And, as Spottorno herself admits<sup>(16)</sup>, the text presupposed by her identification cannot be reconciled with any existing critical edition; neither Rahlfs (1979) nor any of the others corroborate what she suggests as the text of Zech 7,(3b)-5. Admittedly, she may have remembered a seemingly comparable problem in 7Q5 = Mark 6,52-53<sup>(17)</sup>. However, the singular variants in Mark make sense and could

<sup>(15)</sup> See THIEDE, "Bericht", 240.

<sup>(16)</sup> SPOTTORNO, "Una nueva posible identificación", 543.

<sup>(17)</sup> Omission of *epi ten gen* in 6,53 suggested by stichometry; *tau* instead of *delta* in *tiaperasantes* in 6,53.

even be expected, as has been shown more than once<sup>(18)</sup>, whereas Spottorno's variants stem from an extreme and philologically unjustifiable eclecticism. Thus, she does not even try to find reasons for them. For example, there is the omission of *tōn dynameōn* in 7,4; the impossibility of a *spatium* before *kai* in 7,4; the addition of *tēs gēs* between *hiereis* and *legōn* in 7,5; *tō pemptō* instead of *tais pemptais* and *tō hebdomō* instead of *tais hebdomais* in 7,5.

The sheer number of these variants invalidates Spottorno's attempt to improve upon 7Q5 = Mark 6,52-53. Her suggestion is to be rejected as impossible for palaeographical as well as philological reasons.

Institut für Wissenschaftstheoretische  
Grundlagenforschung  
Busdorfwall 16  
D-33098 Paderborn

Carsten Peter THIEDE

### A Note on הרִיחַ (Gen 3,16)

Two noun phrases עֲצָבוֹךָ and הָרִיחַ in Gen 3,16 are usually taken as a hendiadys, "your pain and your conception", and translated as, for example, "the pain of thy conception" (ICC)<sup>(1)</sup>, "your pain in childbearing" (RSV, NIV) and "great labour in childbearing" (REB). However, the idea of pain is rather unsuitable in the state of conception, since the same "pain" is referred to in the parallel line of this verse with regard to childbirth, the act of giving birth to a child (which is expressed by the Hebrew root \*yld):

*harbāh 'arbeh 'iṣṣēbônēk w'hērōnēk*  
*b'eṣeb tēl'di bānīm*

I will greatly increase your pain and your *hērōn*;  
in pain you shall give birth to children.

<sup>(18)</sup> Most recently by HUNGER, "7Q5: Markus 6,52-53 – oder?" and C. P. THIEDE, "Papyrologische Anfragen an 7Q5 im Umfeld antiker Handschriften", *Christen und Christliches*, 57-72. See also ROHRHIRSCH, *Markus in Qumran?*, 73-83, and THIEDE, *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript?*, 29-32.

<sup>(1)</sup> J. SKINNER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (ICC; Edinburgh 1930) 82. Also note "your suffering and your childbearing" (U. CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Part 1: From Adam to Noah* [Jerusalem 1961] 165); "your pain and your childbearing" (C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary* [Minneapolis 1984] 262); "your pains and your pregnancies" (G. J. WENHAM, *Genesis 1-15* [WBC 1; Waco 1987] 81); "your pangs in childbearing" (N. M. SARNA, *Genesis* [JPS Torah Commentary; New York 1989] 27-28).

even be expected, as has been shown more than once<sup>(18)</sup>, whereas Spottorno's variants stem from an extreme and philologically unjustifiable eclecticism. Thus, she does not even try to find reasons for them. For example, there is the omission of *tōn dynameōn* in 7,4; the impossibility of a *spatium* before *kai* in 7,4; the addition of *tēs gēs* between *hiereis* and *legōn* in 7,5; *tō pemptō* instead of *tais pemptais* and *tō hebdomō* instead of *tais hebdomais* in 7,5.

The sheer number of these variants invalidates Spottorno's attempt to improve upon 7Q5 = Mark 6,52-53. Her suggestion is to be rejected as impossible for palaeographical as well as philological reasons.

Institut für Wissenschaftstheoretische  
Grundlagenforschung  
Busdorfwall 16  
D-33098 Paderborn

Carsten Peter THIEDE

### A Note on הרִיחַ (Gen 3,16)

Two noun phrases עֲצָבוֹתְךָ and הָרִיחַ in Gen 3,16 are usually taken as a hendiadys, "your pain and your conception", and translated as, for example, "the pain of thy conception" (ICC)<sup>(1)</sup>, "your pain in childbearing" (RSV, NIV) and "great labour in childbearing" (REB). However, the idea of pain is rather unsuitable in the state of conception, since the same "pain" is referred to in the parallel line of this verse with regard to childbirth, the act of giving birth to a child (which is expressed by the Hebrew root \*yld):

*harbāh 'arbeh 'iṣṣēbônēk w'hērōnēk*  
*b'e'ēṣeb tēl'di bānīm*

I will greatly increase your pain and your *hērōn*;  
in pain you shall give birth to children.

<sup>(18)</sup> Most recently by HUNGER, "7Q5: Markus 6,52-53 – oder?" and C. P. THIEDE, "Papyrologische Anfragen an 7Q5 im Umfeld antiker Handschriften", *Christen und Christliches*, 57-72. See also ROHRHIRSCH, *Markus in Qumran?*, 73-83, and THIEDE, *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript?*, 29-32.

<sup>(1)</sup> J. SKINNER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (ICC; Edinburgh 1930) 82. Also note "your suffering and your childbearing" (U. CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Part 1: *From Adam to Noah* [Jerusalem 1961] 165); "your pain and your childbearing" (C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary* [Minneapolis 1984] 262); "your pains and your pregnancies" (G. J. WENHAM, *Genesis 1-15* [WBC 1; Waco 1987] 81); "your pangs in childbearing" (N. M. SARNA, *Genesis* [JPS Torah Commentary; New York 1989] 27-28).

The term *hērōn* here may refer to the state which includes the act of giving birth, as the English translation "childbearing" implies. However, the usually suggested etymology *\*hry* ("to conceive, become pregnant") does not support such an interpretation, for it always signifies the act of conception or the state of pregnancy before the actual childbirth.

C.L. Myers in her recent article rejects the hendiadic view and translates Gen 3,16 as follows: "I will greatly increase your work and your pregnancies". She explains that they "are independent concepts. On the one hand, the woman's productive work is mentioned and on the other hand reference is made to her procreative role" (2).

However, the real issue here hinges on the question of the etymology of the second phrase הרנך. The term *hērōn* whose form has been taken as a "Mischform" (3) or as "incorrect" (4), has been explained as a substantive, "conception", "pregnancies" or "childbearing", based on the root *\*hry* (הרה), "to conceive". The Samaritan text הריון has been taken as evidence to support it. On the other hand, the MT text הרנך is sometimes translated as "groaning" (5) in the light of LXX's τὸν στεναγμόν, which, according to BHS, reflects הגיך, a substantive based on the root *\*hgy* (הגה), "to groan".

In 1961 C. Rabin attempted to explain *hērōn* as a "sexual desire", or perhaps 'whining' in the light of an Ugaritic term *hrr*, "to desire" (6). This view was accepted by M. Dahood in his lexicographical study of Hebrew and Ugaritic (7). However, the meaning "to desire" for the Ugaritic *hrr* is not well founded, except from the parallelism with *hmd* "to covet" in KTU 1.12 [UT 75]:I:39 (8). Neither Rabin nor Dahood gave an etymology either for Hebrew *hērōn* or Ugaritic *hrr*.

Rabin is probably correct in recognizing a geminate verb *\*hrr* in the Hebrew term *hērōn* since its spelling does not really support the root *\*hry* under a normal situation. Morphologically it seems that the two terms עֲצָבוֹךְ and הרנך, constitute a same nominal pattern, the *qatalān* type. The former noun *\*iṣṣābōn*, which means "pain" or "toil" (9), can be explained as follows: *iṣṣābōn* < *\*aṣabān*; the latter *hērōn* could be explained as: *hērōn* < *hirrān* < *harrān* < *\*hararān* (10).

(2) C.L. MEYERS, "Gender Roles and Genesis 3:26 Revisited", *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday* (ed. C.L. MEYERS—M. O'CONNOR) (Winona Lake 1983) 345.

(3) H. BAUER—P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Hildesheim 1922, 1962) 499.

(4) P. JOÜON—T. MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Subsidia Biblica 14/1; Roma 1991) §88 Mb.

(5) E.g. NEB's translation: "I will increase your labour and your groaning".

(6) C. RABIN, "Etymological Miscellanea", *Studies in the Bible* [= *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8] (1961) 390. Cf. J. GRAY, "Ba'al's Atonement", *UF* 3 (1971) 61-70.

(7) M. DAHOOD, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography II", *Bib* 45 (1964) 404.

(8) Cf. C.H. GORDON, *Ugarit Textbook* (Rome 1965) §19.797. Here KTU stands for M. DIETRICH—O. LORETZ—J. SANMARTIN, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1976).

(9) BDB, 781.

(10) BAUER—LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik*, 539 & 499; JOÜON—MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §88 Mb.

Thus the expression עֲצִבֹתָּךְ וְהֵרִיקָּךְ most likely constitutes a hendiadys or a synonymous word pair whose first element, though in a variant form *‘eṣeb*, is repeated in the parallel line.

The meaning of Hebrew root *\*hrr* then might be better explained in the light of Akkadian *arāru* “to tremble”<sup>(11)</sup>. While the Akkadian form, *arāru*, can be traced to several Semitic roots such as *\*rr*, *\*wrr* and *\*hrr*<sup>(12)</sup>, the meanings which *CAD* A/ii (1968) 236 suggests for *arāru* B, “to fear”, “to become agitated, panic-stricken” or those which *AHW* 1 (1965) 65 suggests, i.e., “zittern, flackern, (auf)brennen”, seem to fit in the present context of Genesis. Moreover, this meaning, i.e., “zittern”, was recently suggested also for the Ugaritic verb *hrr* (G-stem) in the light of Akkadian (*h*)*arāru*<sup>(13)</sup>.

In the light of the above, the Hebrew הֵרִיקָּךְ probably means “your trembling” and hence the increase of woman’s “pain and<sup>(14)</sup> trembling”, i.e. “trembling pain”, should be taken as related to her unique role in childbirth, since the second line of the parallelism refers more specifically to the pain of woman in travail<sup>(15)</sup>.

In conclusion, the etymology of the Hebrew term *hērōn* is not *\*hry* (“to conceive”) but *\*hrr* whose meaning is probably something like “to tremble”; its form follows *\*qatalān* (> *qittālōn*) pattern as in the case of *\*iṣṣābōn*. If this is the case, LXX’s translation, τὸν στεναγμὸν “groaning”, may reflect the meaning of *hērōn* more faithfully than has hitherto been considered. The phrase עֲצִבֹתָּךְ וְהֵרִיקָּךְ thus constitutes a hendiadys “your pain and trembling”, i.e. “your trembling pain”.

Japan Bible Seminary  
2-9-3 Hanenishi  
Hamura, Tokyo 205

David T. TSUMURA

<sup>(11)</sup> The verbal forms of *arāru* appear with a sense of “shaking” (of the mountains) in R. Campbell THOMPSON, *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (Oxford 1930) pl. 10 K.9759:9 (cf. *CAD* N/i [1980] 348) and of “trembling” (of a body) in PBS 12/1 6r. 14f. (cf. *CAD* A/ii [1968] 236; N/i [1980] 348).

<sup>(12)</sup> Note the comment in *CAD* A/ii (1968) 238: “The difficult group of homonymous verbs (*h/w*)*arāru* pose problems which have not yet been adequately solved”.

<sup>(13)</sup> See J. TROPPER, “Zur Morphologie der Verben *primae h* im Ugaritischen und in den anderen nordwestsemitischen Sprachen”, *UF* 22 (1990) 377.

<sup>(14)</sup> E. KAUTZSCH—A. E. COWLEY, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford 1910) 484, take this as an emphatic *waw* (= “and especially”).

<sup>(15)</sup> The Hebrew term *hērōn* could be of the same etymology as the Arabic term *harra* “to snarl (of a dog)”, a nominal form of which, *harīru*, is used for the sound of the turning of the millstone. Cf. E. W. LANE, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* Book I, Part 8 (London 1893) 2888.

## The City of Chaos in Isa 24,10 and the Genitive of Result

ושברה קרית תהו סגר כל בית מבוא

The city has been shattered into a desolation,  
Every house has been shut against entry.

The literal translation of קרית תהו, the construct chain in Isa 24,10, as "city of chaos" may obscure the function of the genitive. The treatment of the Hebrew genitive in the standard grammars is limited by the distinction between nouns and pronouns that modify verbs (accusative) or that modify other nouns (genitive)<sup>(1)</sup>. Yet sometimes the genitive, while modifying another noun in the surface structure, complements the verb in the sentence's deep structure. Failure to notice the difference can seriously affect translation and interpretation. The attempt literally to reflect Hebrew syntax can produce in another language an obscure, not to say erroneous meaning. Such may be the case with the enigmatic "city of chaos".

Grammarians sometimes notice the genitive's relation to the verb. It is implicit, for example, in Joüon's observation that "rather often the idea of the dative is expressed by the genitive"<sup>(2)</sup>. ויתן חנו בעיני שר בבית הסהר, "and he gave favor to him in the eyes of the keeper of the prison" (Gen 39,21b), is a parade example. Although most examples are of pronominal suffixes, nouns too may function in this manner. To חנו in Gen 39,21b Joüon compares חן העם הזה, the construct chain in Exod 3,21, ונתתי את חן העם הזה בעיני מצרים, "I will give favor to this people in the eyes of the Egyptians". Other examples can be added: Deut 11,14 ונתתי מטר ארצכם, "and I will give rain to your land"; Isa 30,23 ונתן מטר וזרעך, "and he will give rain to your seed".

In expressing the "idea of the dative" the genitive functions like a second accusative. Three examples with the verb פשט, 'strip', further illustrate the point. פשט takes a double accusative in Gen 37,23b ופשטו את יוסף את כתנתו, "they stripped from Joseph his tunic". In Job 22,6b, it takes an accusative and genitive ערומים תפשט, "and you strip the garments from the naked". In Job 19,9a פשט governs an accusative and prepositional phrase מעלי הפשט, "he has stripped my honor from me". Job 19,9b provides another example of the genitive as second accusative ויסר עטרת ראשי, "and he has removed the crown from my head". עטרת ראשי, a construct chain, parallels מעלי, the accusative and prepositional phrase in the first colon.

<sup>(1)</sup> See most recently, for example, B. K. WALTKE-M. O'CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN 1990) 136-137.

<sup>(2)</sup> P. JOÜON, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique* (Rome 1923), §129h. See also S. E. LOEWENSTAMM, "On the Predicative Use of the Suffix, Joined to a Subject-Noun, in Hebrew and Ugaritic", *Leš* 38 (1973) 149-150, v-vi (in Hebrew). For dative and other non-accusative uses of verbal suffixes, see M. BOGAERT, "Les suffixes verbaux non accusatifs dans le sémitique nord-occidental et particulièrement en hébreu", *Bib* 45 (1964) 220-247.

So far the examples cited have been of the genitive complementing the verb as indirect object in the deep structure. In Ps 65,12 the genitive functions like an accusative of material, עטרת שבת טובתך ומעגליך יעפוך רשן, "You have crowned the year with your goodness, and your paths drip with fatness". The construct chain, שנת טובתך, provides both direct object and accusative of material for the verb עטר. טובתך, the genitive, is paralleled by the accusative of material רשן in the second colon; cf. the double accusative גבעות גיל in Ps 65,13b, parallel to the construct chain of v. 12a in the chiasmic structure of vv. 12-13.

To return to Isa 24,10, the point at issue is whether the genitive תהו may modify the verb נשברה in the deep structure. Some translations avoid the literal "city of chaos", but retain the genitive as modifier of the noun "city": "Towns are broken, empty" (*JPSV*); "La ciudad, desolada, se derrumba" (*Los Libros Sagrados*). The translation given at the beginning of this note, "the city has been shattered into a desolation", takes the genitive תהו to modify the verb and function like an accusative of product or result<sup>(3)</sup>.

The parallelism favors this solution. Isa 24,10-12 are a unit in which vv. 10 and 12 closely parallel one another.

10 ונשברה קריית תהו סגר כל בית מבוא  
12 נשאר בעיר שמה ושאיח יכת שער

10 The city has been shattered into a desolation, Every house has been shut against entry.

12 Devastation is left in the town, And the gate has been smashed into ruins.

Three word pairs, עיר קריית (Isa 1,26; 22,2; 25,1; Jer 49,25; Hab 2,12), יכת//נשברה (Isa 30,14), and שער//בית (Ps 122,1-2; Gen 28,17), connect the two verses. Of particular significance for understanding קריית תהו is the brace, יכת//נשברה, since יכת, probably Qal passive, takes the accusative of result שאיח; see GKC §121d<sup>(4)</sup>. שאיח is hapax. Still, since תהו is used to describe the destruction of cities in Jer 4,23 and Isa 34,11, nothing prevents it being used in a parallel sense to the accusative of result, שאיח.

I have argued that the genitive תהו, though modifying the noun קריית in the surface structure of Isa 24,10a, modifies the verb נשברה in the colon's deep structure. To render the construct chain reflecting its surface structure is to obscure the meaning of the clause that "the city has been shattered *into a desolation*". Examples of the genitive functioning like the

<sup>(3)</sup> *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (ed. E. Kautzsch) (Oxford 1910) §121d and §117ii. See also R.J. WILLIAMS, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline* (Toronto <sup>2</sup>1976) §44. But the "result" is evidently that of an action implicit in the *nomen regens*, not in the verb.

<sup>(4)</sup> Compare JOÜON, §129c and 125w, who classifies it as "le second objet d'un verbe doublement transitif" (129c).



accusative as indirect object or accusative of material established the *admissibility* of such an interpretation from the point of view of Hebrew syntax. The parallelism between vv. 10 and 12 and more specifically between the verbs *נִשְׁבַּרָה* and *יָכַח* in vv. 10a and 12b with the accusative of result, *שֶׁאִי* in v. 12b, supported the proposed interpretation's contextual suitability. The source of the difficulty lay in the relation of surface and deep structure that does not always remain the same when the surface structure is translated into another language. The result has broader implications for biblical exegesis and translation.

University of St. Michael's College  
81 St. Mary St.  
Toronto, ON M5S 1J4  
Canada

William H. IRWIN, C.S.B.

### Vilification as a Pragmatic Device in Early Christian Epistolography<sup>(1)</sup>

#### I. Introductory Remarks

The study of the pragmatics of linguistic communication is flourishing. And deservedly so. For many a long day the performative dimension of language has been neglected in favour of the propositional. This is also true of New Testament studies. We have too long neglected the fact that in one way or another each of these writings seeks to persuade its readers/audience in a certain direction. To ask what a New Testament text is *doing* is at least as important as asking what it is *saying*. Fortunately there has been a drastic change in the last two decades, although much solid work has still to be done. In some respects we are really only starting. Scholars are increasingly coming to realize that a disciplined application of insights from speech act analysis, rhetorical analysis, reception criticism and various sociological approaches can help us to a much richer understanding of early Christian literature.

Vilifying your opponent, like praising your addressees, has through the centuries been a useful persuasive weapon from the arsenal of a skilled speaker or writer. They could even be applied in combination. When doing so in his writing against Flaccus, Philo explains his procedure as follows: 'I praise Flaccus, not because I have thought it right to laud an enemy, but to show his villainy in a clearer light' (*In Flaccum* 7). The techniques of praise

<sup>(1)</sup> Paper presented at the SNTS congress in Madrid, July 1992.

accusative as indirect object or accusative of material established the *admissibility* of such an interpretation from the point of view of Hebrew syntax. The parallelism between vv. 10 and 12 and more specifically between the verbs נִשְׁבְּרָה and יִכָּת in vv. 10a and 12b with the accusative of result, שָׁאִיָּה in v. 12b, supported the proposed interpretation's contextual suitability. The source of the difficulty lay in the relation of surface and deep structure that does not always remain the same when the surface structure is translated into another language. The result has broader implications for biblical exegesis and translation.

University of St. Michael's College  
81 St. Mary St.  
Toronto, ON M5S 1J4  
Canada

William H. IRWIN, C.S.B.

### Vilification as a Pragmatic Device in Early Christian Epistolography<sup>(1)</sup>

#### I. Introductory Remarks

The study of the pragmatics of linguistic communication is flourishing. And deservedly so. For many a long day the performative dimension of language has been neglected in favour of the propositional. This is also true of New Testament studies. We have too long neglected the fact that in one way or another each of these writings seeks to persuade its readers/audience in a certain direction. To ask what a New Testament text is *doing* is at least as important as asking what it is *saying*. Fortunately there has been a drastic change in the last two decades, although much solid work has still to be done. In some respects we are really only starting. Scholars are increasingly coming to realize that a disciplined application of insights from speech act analysis, rhetorical analysis, reception criticism and various sociological approaches can help us to a much richer understanding of early Christian literature.

Vilifying your opponent, like praising your addressees, has through the centuries been a useful persuasive weapon from the arsenal of a skilled speaker or writer. They could even be applied in combination. When doing so in his writing against Flaccus, Philo explains his procedure as follows: 'I praise Flaccus, not because I have thought it right to laud an enemy, but to show his villainy in a clearer light' (*In Flaccum* 7). The techniques of praise

<sup>(1)</sup> Paper presented at the SNTS congress in Madrid, July 1992.

and blame correspond<sup>(2)</sup> to the *laudatio* and *vituperatio* of classical rhetorical theory, which were *officia* of the *genus demonstrativum*<sup>(3)</sup>. But all public speakers who seek to influence their audience, e.g. politicians and all kinds of demagogues, intuitively know the persuasive force of these devices.

Narrowing down this paper to the theme of vilification in early Christian letters, we must point out that it should be understood against the background of the widespread convention of vilifying opponents which obtained throughout the Mediterranean world. Luke Johnson has verified this phenomenon by numerous examples from contemporary Hellenistic polemic, as well as from representatives of diverse Jewish groupings outside and inside Palestine<sup>(4)</sup>. There are striking parallels between these specimens of vilification and those in our corpus of investigation.

Explicit and implicit vilification occurs mostly in those New Testament and other early Christian letters<sup>(5)</sup> where certain opponents are exposed, that is, where the readers/audience are urged to dissociate themselves from the opponents and endorse the author's viewpoint. The depiction of these opponents is a construct of the author. We should therefore differentiate between the "encoded opponents" and their real-life counterparts<sup>(6)</sup>. We shall return later to the difficult question regarding the relationship between these two instances. Not all encoded opponents, of course, have direct real-life referents. Paradigmatic<sup>(7)</sup> or hypothetical<sup>(8)</sup> opponents may be brought in *ad hoc* and vilified for the sake of arguing a certain point.

## II. Vilifying Trends

This paper is quite modest in scope. Even if restricted to early Christian letters, the process of vilification has so many facets and covers such a broad field that I shall restrict myself, first, to identifying some of the most prominent trends which tended to become — or may already have

(2) My position regarding the relationship between New Testament letter-writing and Graeco-Roman rhetoric was stated in my article "Persuasion in Romans 1:1-17", *BZ* 13 (1989) 193-196.

(3) For an overview see the well-known work of H. LAUSBERG, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, I (München 1960) 55, 131-138, 205-206, 542. Although belonging primarily to the *genus demonstrativum*, these *officia* were used extensively also in the two other *genera*; cf. LAUSBERG, *ibid.*, 61, 132.

(4) L. T. JOHNSON, "The New Testament's Anti-Jewish Slander and the Conventions of Ancient Polemic", *JBL* 108 (1989) 419-441.

(5) I am interpreting the qualification 'early' in the title of my paper somewhat broadly, including letters of the sub-apostolic period up to round about the middle of the second century. Because of the semantic proximity between the listing of opponents and vice catalogues, some references to the latter are included. It is, of course, sometimes almost impossible to distinguish between the vilifying of antagonists and vice catalogues.

(6) Although in this article I shall not constantly distinguish between these two concepts, their difference should be kept in mind throughout.

(7) E.g. well-known characters from the Old Testament or from general history. In the *Epistle to Diognetus* 8, for instance, Greek philosophers are used in this way and vilified as pretentious quacks and magicians.

(8) The opponent in rhetorical questions may be paradigmatic or hypothetical.

become — stereotyped<sup>(9)</sup>, and, secondly, to setting this phenomenon within the broader context of mirror-reading a polemical text.

### 1. *Hypocrisy and falseness*

That this accusation was a popular trend in vilification we know from the gospels<sup>(10)</sup>. In the New Testament letters the ὑπόκρισις-label is only once applied directly to adversaries, viz. in 1 Tim 4,2. But in Gal 2,13 the behaviour of Peter *cum suis* is also labelled as hypocritical (συνυπεκρίθησαν; ὑποκρίσει), this whole group being used by Paul as a window on his Galatian antagonists<sup>(11)</sup>. The hypocrisy-charge appears also in 1 Clem 15,1, in Polycarp's letter to the *Philippians* 6,3, and in *Barn* 20,1 (ὑπόκρισις, διπλοκαρδία; cf. also *Did* 2,6). The semantically closely-related δόλος word-group is also applied in this regard. The false apostles of 2 Cor 11,13 are called 'deceitful workers' (ἐργάται δόλιοι)<sup>(12)</sup>.

In 2 Cor 11,13-15 the verb μετασχηματίζω is used repeatedly in connection with the Corinthian adversaries. They are real frauds, disguising their own identity, pretending to be what they are not<sup>(13)</sup>. For this reason the ψεῦδ-prefix is repeatedly employed in designating opposition groups: they are called 'false apostles' (2 Cor 11,13; cf. Rev 2,2), 'false brothers' (Gal 2,4), 'false teachers' (2 Pet 2,1), 'false prophets' (1 John 4,1, cf. 2 Pet 2,1). In Rev 2,2 the opposition is unequivocally branded 'liars' (ψευδοεῖς; cf. also 3,9).

<sup>(9)</sup> Also most of the many implicit examples have had to be ignored. It is a pity that the vilifying material in the gospels cannot be discussed here (S. FREYNE, 'Vilifying the Other and Defining the Self: Matthew's and John's Anti-Jewish Polemic in Focus', "To see ourselves as others see us". *Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity* (ed. J. NEUSNER—E. S. FRERICHs) (Chico 1985) 117-143, has written a stimulating article on certain aspects of vilification in the gospels of Matthew and John). I do make a few references, however, to Acts. In spite of the specific character of the seven letters in Revelation — D. E. AUNE, "The Form and Function of the Proclamations to the Seven Churches (Revelation 2-3)", *NTS* 36 (1990) 182-204, prefers to call them proclamations rather than letters — some references to them are relevant to our purpose.

<sup>(10)</sup> For the significance of this label cf. FREYNE, "Vilifying", 133-134; also B. MALINA—J. H. NEYREY, *Calling Jesus Names. The Value of Labels in Matthew* (Foundations and Facets; Sonoma 1988) 64-66, who draw attention to the very important social role of labelling people. Freyne is of opinion that the hypocrite epithet in Matthew 23 'does not so much imply conscious dissimulation as faulty conclusions drawn from false premises' (ibid. 134). But this would not really fit in well within the vilifying context of the said chapter.

<sup>(11)</sup> In his article on ὑποκρίνομαι κτλ (*TWNT* VII, 558-571) W. Wilckens argues that ὑπόκρισις is used in Gal 2,13 in close proximity to the LXX sense of 'Frevel' (ibid., 568), but this is not correct. By withdrawing from eating with the non-Jewish Christians Peter and his group pretended that they were still adhering to the purity precepts, while in fact they had already adopted a different life-style (3,14).

<sup>(12)</sup> In this regard cf. also the scathing attack of Paul on Elimas (Acts 13,10): 'utter fraud (= πλήρης παντός δόλου) and villain'. This word-group occurs, of course, also in vice-lists: cf. Rom 1,29; 3,13; 2 Cor 4,2; 1 Thess 2,3; 1 Pet 2,1; 3,10.

<sup>(13)</sup> Cf. also Tit 1,10 where the adversaries are labelled as φρεναπάται = deceivers.

## 2. *Obscure, shadowy characters*

To discredit antagonists they are occasionally depicted as stealthy characters who carry out their hidden agendas in the dark. In this regard the metaphor of 'smuggling' is applied twice in the New Testament (Gal 2,4: *παρεισάκτους*; 2 Pet 2,1: *παρεισάξουσιν*). Jude 4 uses a semantically closely-related word: *παρεισέδυσαν*: (some) slipped in secretly. Paul furthermore depicts the 'false brothers who had been smuggled' into Galatia as people who 'had infiltrated our ranks in order to *spy on* (*κατασκοπήσαι*) our freedom' (ibid.). They are real undercover agents. The military connotations in these metaphors are clear<sup>(14)</sup>.

The almost universal use of the indefinite pronoun *τινες* in vilifying passages confronts us with an intriguing problem. It is certainly no easy matter to determine the subtler nuances of linguistic usage in Greek documents written twenty centuries ago in a totally different cultural setting, especially those nuances which, to a large extent, would have been brought out by the modulation of one's voice. The consistent employment of *τινες* or some other equally vague term in referring to antagonists may be due simply to the need for a cover-term to designate a limited grouping of persons whose identity the writer cannot or does not care to indicate more particularly. But there may be another possibility. As is also the case in modern languages, the indefinite pronoun may carry a derisive connotation, especially discernible in spoken language by a certain tone of voice. In this case the identity of the referents is intentionally suppressed and the pronoun is used pejoratively. It can be pejorative in two respects: It may be a *deliberate belittling* of the number of people comprising the opposition. This tendency is clear for instance from *1 Clem* where the strife and sedition among the Corinthians are ascribed to 'a few headstrong and self-willed persons' (1,1), as a matter of fact only 'one or two persons' (47,6). The use of *τινες* may display this same tendency. But it may also be aimed at a *deliberate blurring* of the faces of opponents in order to portray them as negative, shadowy characters.

As already stated, it is very difficult indeed to decide whether this strongly pejorative connotation is present in the New Testament. One could argue that *τινες* was the obvious way of referring to an opposing party. But in my opinion this may not have been the case in a number of its New Testament occurrences. In polemical passages like Rom 3,8; 1 Cor 4,18; 2 Cor 3,1; 10,2; Gal 1,7; 2,12 and in many more instances *τινες* probably has a strongly negative force<sup>(15)</sup>. In this regard a note by Ignatius, also referred to by Betz<sup>(16)</sup>, may be significant. After referring to those who deny the full humanity of Jesus Christ as *τινες* (*Smyrn* 5,1) he adds: 'But their names, being unbelievers, I have not thought fit to record in writing;

<sup>(14)</sup> H. D. BETZ, *Galatians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1979) 90.

<sup>(15)</sup> Cf. further my article "Alienation and Re-identification as Tools of Persuasion in Galatians", *Neotestamentica* 26 (1992) 279-295; also BETZ, *Galatians*, 49, 268, although he interprets the use of *τινες* as a ploy to deny the Galatian agitators free publicity.

<sup>(16)</sup> BETZ, *Galatians*, 49.

be it far from me to remember (= mention) them until they repent regarding Christ's suffering, which is our resurrection' (5,3). Interesting also is Chrysostom's remark with reference to Paul's Galatian opponents: 'And observe that he (= Paul) never mentions the name of these schemers, that they might not become more shameless'. In Ignatius, *Smyrn* 2 (cf. *Trall* 10), we have the following reference to docetic teachers: 'not as certain unbelievers (ἄπιστοι τινες) say, that he suffered in semblance (τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι), being themselves mere semblance (αὐτοὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ὄντες)'. Apart from the word-play on δοκεῖν the vagueness inherent in the use of τινες may have heightened the effect of the statement<sup>(17)</sup>.

### 3. Sorcery

Although Malina may have somewhat overestimated the role of the witchcraft accusation in Mediterranean societies during the first century AD, its prevalence certainly cannot be denied<sup>(18)</sup>. In the New Testament letters the most obvious example of vilification of this kind is Gal 3,1: 'You foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you (Τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν) (who has put a spell on you)...?' Even though the labelling of the Galatian opposition is indirect and metaphorical, its vilifying force is clear. The antagonists have acted as sorcerers. With an 'evil eye' they have brought the Galatian Christians under their spell. Was the shocking double ἀνάθεμα of chapter 1 introduced so early with the intention of breaking this spell? If γόητες in 2Tim 3,13 refers to magicians, which is quite possible, we have here a second example of the sorcery label. *Barn* 20,1 and *Diog* 8,4 also reflect the same accusation<sup>(19)</sup>.

### 4. Inflated self-esteem

Opponents are often depicted as people with an inflated self-consciousness which manifests itself in arrogance, boasting and self-elevation. For the charge of arrogance the terms preferred are ἀλαζονεία (James 4,16; 2Tim 3,2; *1 Clem* 14,1; 16,2; 21,5 cf. Rom 1,30; *1 Clem* 35,5), αὐθάδεια (2Pet 2,10; *1 Clem* 1,1: together with προπετής; 30,8; *Barn* 20,1)<sup>(20)</sup> and ὑπερηφανία (2Tim 3,2; *1 Clem* 16,2; 30,1-2; *Ign Eph* 5,3; *Barn* 20,1)<sup>(21)</sup>.

<sup>(17)</sup> The pejorative connotation is also quite clear in *1 Clem* 59: "But if certain persons should be disobedient unto the words spoken by Him through us, let them understand that they will entangle themselves in no slight transgression and danger..."

<sup>(18)</sup> See MALINA – NEYREY, *Calling Jesus Names*, 3-32.

<sup>(19)</sup> Cf. Acts 8,9-11; 13,6-8; Rev 9,21; 18,23; *Did* 2,2; 5,1. It could be asked whether the mention of φαρμακεία as one of the ἔργα of the flesh in Gal 5,20 is not an indirect labelling of the antagonists as sorcerers, but this may be too audacious. Cf. Acts 8,9-11.

<sup>(20)</sup> Cf. the inverse in Tit 1,7.

<sup>(21)</sup> See also *1 Clem* 35,5.

The καύχησις-label was, of course, a quite popular denigrating device (cf. Rom 2,17.23; 2 Cor 10,12-18; 11,12.18; Gal 6,13; James 4,16; *1 Clem* 21,5; *Ign Eph* 18,1)<sup>(22)</sup>. Closely related to this is the accusation of self-exaltation (2 Cor 11,20; *1 Clem* 14,1; 16,1; 21,5; 39,1).

Semantically approximating to these imputations, which are all manifestations of human *hubris*, is the charge of blasphemy, however vacillating its meaning in different contexts may be. The denigratory force of this assertion, with its strong connotation of violating the majesty of God, especially when used to slander God's servants<sup>(23)</sup>, made it a powerful pragmatic device. It surely was one of the gravest labels which could be attached to anyone. For this reason it was widely applied to antagonists (Rom 3,8; 1 Cor 10,30; 1 Tim 1,20; 6,4; 2 Tim 3,2; James 2,7; 1 Pet 4,4; 2 Pet 2,2.10-12 par. Jude 8-10; Rev 2,9)<sup>(24)</sup>. The labels of ἄθεοι (*Ign Trall* 3,2; 10,1; *Mart Pol* 9,2b) and ἀφοβία Θεοῦ (*Barn* 20,1) may also be included here.

### 5. Moral depravity

One of the most conspicuous techniques, which certainly became stereotyped, was that of negating the moral integrity of antagonists. Their inner motives were wicked, belying their pious words. The Galatian opponents for instance are depicted as people who in fact were acting from selfish motives: they wanted to avoid persecution (6,12). Their insistence on circumcision was actually so that they could boast about the Galatian Christians (6,13). Their real aim was to enslave these Christians once again (Gal 2,4<sup>(25)</sup> cf. 2 Cor 11,20). In some instances we find the insinuation that greed underlies the charge of a profiteering intention (πλεονεξία: 2 Pet 2,3.14; *Barn* 20,2)<sup>(26)</sup>. Profiteering and exploiting as such, especially seeking for financial gain, are frequent accusations (1 Tim 6,5; Tit 1,11; 2 Pet 2,3.15; *Barn* 20,2 cf. *Did* 5,2). The connection between religion and money-making does not only have a long history; it constitutes also a stereotyped technique of vilification<sup>(27)</sup>. The same is true of all kinds of moral licentiousness e.g. sexual misbehaviour (2 Pet 2,10.14.18; Jude 7-8; Rev 2,14. 20-22; *Barn* 20,1; cf. 2 Pet 2,2; Jude 4,16.18.23) and gluttony (Rom 16,18; Phil 3,19; 2 Pet 2,13; Jude 12)<sup>(28)</sup>. Particularly negative tags are those of "empty talking" (1 Tim 1,6; Tit 1,10) and evil-speaking (*1 Clem* 30,1; *Pol* 2,2)<sup>(29)</sup>.

<sup>(22)</sup> The adjective ὑπέρογκος in 2 Pet 2,18 par. Jude 16 belongs to the same semantic field: J.P. LOUW – E. NIDA (ed.), *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains*, I (New York 1988) 432. For the concept, see R. BULTMANN, "καυχᾶσθαι κτλ", *TWNT* VII, 646-654.

<sup>(23)</sup> In his article "βλασφημέω κτλ", *TWNT* I, 620-624, G. Delling pays too little attention to this aspect.

<sup>(24)</sup> Cf. Eph 4,31; Col 3,8; 1 Tim 1,13.

<sup>(25)</sup> The indirect reference is to the Galatian agitators.

<sup>(26)</sup> Cf. Rom 1,29; 1 Thess 2,5; *1 Clem* 35,5; *Did* 2,6; 5,1; *Pol* 2.2. Φιλαργυρία is a closely related accusation: 2 Tim 3,2; cf. *Pol* 2,2; 4,3; 6,1; 2 *Clem* 6,4; *Did* 3,5.

<sup>(27)</sup> See the discussion of this vilificatory device in H. MOXNES, *The Economy of the Kingdom* (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Philadelphia 1988) 4-9.

<sup>(28)</sup> Cf. also Rom 1,24-27.

<sup>(29)</sup> See also *Did* 2,3; 5,1.

The blackening of the moral character of the opposition reaches a climax in associating them with Satan himself<sup>(30)</sup>. This is probably the drift of Rom 16,20, read together with 16,17-19. And this is also what Paul is intimating in 2 Cor 10,13-15. The false apostles are masquerading as apostles because they stand in the service of the Satan, who is a master of this kind of trickery. The dissidents of 1 Tim 5,15 have not in fact turned to some new doctrine, but to Satan himself. The teaching of the opposition is ascribed to demons (4,1). This is, however, especially the case with the letters in the book of Revelation. The opposition is repeatedly denigrated as a 'synagogue of Satan' (2,9,13; 3,9 cf. also the concluding clause of 2,13). Ignatius defames the docetists as 'demon-possessed' (δαιμονικοί - *Smyrn* 2). In the *Barnabas* letter Satan is twice directly called the 'Black One' (ὁ μέλας; 4,9; 20,1), the implication being that all included in the vice list of *Barn* 20 are associated with him and equally maligned.

#### 6. *A perverse influence*

In various ways the opposition is being portrayed as having a negative influence on the readers/audience<sup>(31)</sup>. As also happens in the gospels<sup>(32)</sup>, their corrupting influence in Galatians is characterized by the yeast metaphor (5,9). Typically the opposition is depicted as instigators of spiritual turmoil and sedition (Gal 5,12: ἀναστατούντες). The verb ταρασσώ is used in the former sense (Gal 1,7; 5,10)<sup>(33)</sup>. In *1 Clem*, due to the purpose of that document, the antagonists are the scapegoats causing all sedition, tumult and strife among the Corinthian Christians<sup>(34)</sup>.

A special form of labelling was to stigmatize the opposition as being not only dissidents themselves, but also agents of the deviance process<sup>(35)</sup>. Christians enjoying the security of their recognized in-group with its well-defined boundaries, its communal values, its mutual responsibilities and expectations, were enticed into breaking away from it. In the Pastorals the false teachers are depicted as dissidents (1 Tim 1,6; 2 Tim 2,18); but they have also subverted the faith of others (2 Tim 2,18; cf. 1 Tim 5,15; 2 Tim 4,4).

<sup>(30)</sup> Cf. Acts 13,10 where Elimas the magician (sic) is addressed as 'child of the devil', besides being labelled in other ways; also Mark 8,33 par. Matt 16,23; Matt 23,15.

<sup>(31)</sup> I use the term 'audience' in view of the fact that Paul's letters, and presumably most if not all of the other letters were intended for public reading.

<sup>(32)</sup> Mark 8,15 par. See also Acts 15,24.

<sup>(33)</sup> See also Acts 15,24; 17,13; 19,23.

<sup>(34)</sup> *1 Clem* passim. For the label of being a corrupting influence cf. also *Ign Eph* 9,1: 'sowers of evil seed'; *Barn* 20,2: 'corrupters of God's handiwork'.

<sup>(35)</sup> This is not the same as what MALINA – NEYREY, *Calling Jesus Names*, 46ff., term 'deviance-processing agents'. But their presentation of deviance theory (ibid., 36ff.) provides an important indication of the utter seriousness of the deviance accusation.



### 7. Associated with dubious historical characters

We know from contemporary Judaism that the name Balaam became associated with the very essence of villainy<sup>(36)</sup>. Thrice in the New Testament oppositional groups receive this very negative tag, with its repulsive connotations (2Pet 2,15; Jude 11; Rev 2,14). The name Jezebel is also used in this way (Rev 2,20-23).

### 8. Prone to judgement

One of the most forceful pragmatic techniques in the vilifying process, and one widely used, was the judgement-threat. The antagonists were heading for God's punishment, whether it would be carried out on judgement day or, at least partly, sooner. Occasionally the threat is somewhat watered down: 2Cor 11,15; Gal 5,10; 2Pet 3,16; 2Clem 10,5. At other times it is expressed strongly, as in 2Peter and Jude (2Pet 2,3-22; Jude 4-16). This happens also in 1Thess 2,16 and 2Thess 1,8. The scorching double ἀνάθεμα of Gal 1,8-9 is nothing but an invoking of God's eschatological wrath on the false teachers of Galatia. One should not, however, overlook its pragmatic thrust, as is so often done. It is in reality not aimed at the false teachers themselves, but at shocking the Galatian audience to their senses<sup>(37)</sup>.

### 9. Ludicrous characters

Classical rhetoric recognized two kinds of *vituperatio*: a severe one and a 'lighter one' which consisted in ridiculing one's opponent (*vituperatio: quae si gravior posita sit, severa est, si levius, ridicula* – Quintilian *Inst Orat* VI 3,37). Although characterised as being of a 'lighter nature', a witty remark ridiculing the adversary could be devastating. Not all ecclesiastical writers possessed the gift or inclination to combine wit with vilification. Tertullian, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and even Origen had both<sup>(38)</sup>. And occasionally also Paul. In Phil 3,2-3 after somewhat mischievously inverting the gibe 'dogs', which Jews applied to non-Jews, to refer to the Judaizers themselves, he continues with a pun on circumcision (κατατομή vs περιτομή), which certainly put his adversaries in a ludicrous light<sup>(39)</sup>. The same would be the case with his nicknaming the false apostles operating in Corinthians the 'super-apostles' (οἱ ὑπερπλήϊαν ἀπόστολοι: 2Cor 11,5; 12,11). But the prize example of a grim Pauline joke, which completely flattened his opponents, would be the satiric ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται of Gal 5,12. One can almost see the smile on the face of more than one staunch Galatian!

<sup>(36)</sup> He was the "vollendeter Frevler" — K. G. KUHN, «Βαλαάμ» *TWNT* I, 522. This is especially clear from the available Qumran evidence.

<sup>(37)</sup> FREYNE, "Vilifying", 137-138, has pointed out that precisely the same process is at work in Matt 23. The context makes it clear that the 'woes' directed at the Pharisees are as a matter of fact a stern warning to the Matthean community.

<sup>(38)</sup> See H. Freiherr von CAMPENHAUSEN, "Ein Witz des Apostels Paulus", *Aus der Frühzeit des Christentums* (Tübingen 1963) 102-103.

<sup>(39)</sup> Against von CAMPENHAUSEN, "Ein Witz", 104, who does not see this as a comic remark.

### III. The Relationship between the Encoded Adversaries and Their Real-life Counterparts

From a methodological perspective it would certainly be naïve to accept a one to one relationship between the depiction of the encoded adversaries in our documents and their real-life counterparts. An element of distortion must certainly be accepted. Ideological literature works with contrasts; it does not seek the neutral middle-field. It creates heroes and villains.

On the other hand we should not over-simplify. Not all vilificatory texts function on the same level. The element of distortion may vary between different writers and even within the same document. In passages where a greater element of historical information was required, e.g. where an author was arguing his case and had to refer to the teaching of the opposition, the correlation between presentation and historicity would be proportionally greater. Apart from the constraints of Christian ethical standards, it would undermine the *ethos* of a writer if he were perceived as untrustworthy. A disturbing discrepancy between *verba* and *res* would put the *sinceritas* of the author in jeopardy. Or to use the terminology of speech act analysis: it would undermine the Maxim of Quality. But in passages where the attitudes, motivation and character of the adversaries dominated, their depiction was determined by the strongly subjective experiences and perceptions of the writer and by his personal interpretation of their actions within the framework of an existential ideological conflict. In these texts the element of historical reference would certainly diminish. Of course this does not mean that even strongly vilificatory texts may not in some way or other be related to a real-life situation. In those instances where the vilificatory language has become stereotyped, however, as in many of the instances I have cited, the historical element has disappeared. The references to the opposition are not intended to characterize them otherwise than that they are in fact opposition and should be strongly rejected<sup>(40)</sup>.

The hyperbolic and often stereotyped character of vilificatory utterances belonged to the rules of the polemical 'game' in general, and was accepted and understood as such by both speaker and audience. Everyone knew that these utterances were basically intended to convey the thrust of the author's negative feeling and convictions regarding his adversaries, and to induce his addressees to share them; in short, he wanted, by means of the vilificatory process, primarily to influence. It would be in this tradition that, e.g. Josephus (*Contra Apionem* 2,7) fulminates against Apion that he has 'the mind of an ass and the impudence of a dog'. And much later even the worthy Calvin does not hesitate to label his opponents 'venomous dogs spitting out all kinds of blasphemies' (*Inst* III 13,2)<sup>(41)</sup>.

<sup>(40)</sup> JOHNSON, "The New Testament's Anti-Jewish Slander", 29-30, 33, 41 has seen this quite correctly.

<sup>(41)</sup> M. Josuttis reminds us of the extremes to which Luther went in vilifying the "Papists"; see his article "Über Feindbilder in der Predigt", *Rhetorik und Theologie in der Predigtarbeit* (München 1985) 87-114.

The perlocutionary aim of the relevant early Christian passages was intended primarily not to characterize the adversaries, but to put pressure on the readers/audience to dissociate themselves from them and reaffirm their allegiance to the author's position. This was done by black-painting the opposition as hypocrites, as shadowy and immoral figures, etc. Who would believe this type of people? Who would venture to be associated with them? Who would want to be a laughing-stock like them?

Coming back to the historical problem: the bottom line is that vilificatory texts should be approached with much caution, and that every text should be scrutinized individually and within its own linguistic and social context. Every suspected historical clue should be carefully checked and, if possible, double-checked by other evidence. To use these texts naïvely on the informational level is to abuse them<sup>(42)</sup>.

Department of New Testament (B)  
University of Pretoria  
Pretoria 0002  
Republic of South Africa

Andrie DU TOIT

<sup>(42)</sup> One of the worst examples of abusing a vilifying utterance would be that of W. LÜTGERT, *Gesetz und Geist. Zur Vorgeschichte des Galaterbriefes* (BFCTh 22.6; Gütersloh 1919) 31ff., who reads into Gal 5,12 that Paul's opposition had been influenced by the Cybele-cult, in which priests were castrated!

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

EMANUEL TOV, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press – Assen/Maastricht, Van Gorcum, 1992. XL-456 p. 16 × 24

Emanuel Tov is at the forefront of text critical scholarship of the Hebrew Bible as an editor of the Hebrew University Bible Project, and Editor-in-chief of the Dead Sea Scrolls publication project. His earlier work on *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3 [Jerusalem 1981]) broke new ground as well as providing an introduction and frame of reference for the serious student. The work under review is a more comprehensive introduction to textual criticism. The preface explains that the present volume was first envisaged as a revision and translation of his earlier book פרקי מבוא — ביקורת נוסח מרקרא published in Hebrew in 1989 in Jerusalem. The revision became so thorough as to produce a new book. The term “introduction” has been dropped from the title. This is appropriate for this is more an introduction to the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, written for neophytes by a master of the craft. It is also a scholarly reassessment of the central issues.

Textual criticism is sometimes considered to be an abstruse craft of acknowledged importance but doubtful relevance, practiced by a few occupants of well-funded chairs in old universities untouched by recession. Yet it would be hard to respect any study of the ancient world for which the formation of the great religious texts and their transmission were irrelevant. This handsomely presented book which is at once technically accurate and pedagogically sound will be of great use both for those who intend to specialise in textual criticism and those for whom a reference point is needed while they pursue their studies in other domains.

The genre is synthesis. Examples rather than lists are often given. This is particularly the case in chapter 2 “Textual Witnesses of the Hebrew Bible” (21-154). This helps the student reader to become aware of phenomena, and develop critical judgement rather than refer to a comprehensive classification expressed in a printed list. It is also a help to the more experienced reader whose confidence in the argument of the author is strengthened by reference to the examples. Where appropriate, references are given to works which give full data (e.g. 277).

One of the great strengths of this book is that the material relating to the Dead Sea Scrolls is integrated to the wider discussion of the history

of the text much more fully than in previous introductions. The section concerned specifically with this controversial material is succinct (100-117) but the author's great familiarity with the material colours the whole book. The treatment of the Dead Sea Scrolls in a section apart as though the place where the scrolls were found was their primary characteristic is an indication that the integration of the Qumran material is not yet complete. In the present state of textual criticism, the matter could hardly be otherwise. Integration goes much further in the case of the Cairo Genizah fragments, introduced without separate heading on page 33 and mentioned a further seven times in the course of the book.

The rich bibliography is collected at the head of the appropriate sections, and the names of the authors are indexed at the end of the book. Confusing cross referencing is avoided by a prefatory list of short titles and abbreviations of works frequently cited. The ample bibliography includes many items written in modern Hebrew, a language of growing importance for Biblical and textual studies. The quibble may be mean, but this reviewer regrets the absence of a full bibliography which would collect the ample references through the book. The bibliographies at the beginning of sections would be easier to use if the authors' names were picked out typographically in some way.

Textual criticism is impossible without a view of the history of the text. One of the most original contributions of this book is the description given of the development of the Biblical text (155-197). In a refreshing contrast to the dogmatism of previous views on the subject, the author honestly allows that "readers will find less information than they would like, since we do not (yet?) possess sufficient knowledge to be able to give this topic a full description" (187). The student is not spared the ambiguity of a situation where it is argued that during a brief "period of relative textual unity" there were also current among the people a few copies representing stages which preceded the completion of the literary composition (189). The unity that followed the adoption of this text was in any case short-lived, as copying errors and textual contamination of various kinds occurred.

In the survey of the period preceding the adoption of a particular stable form of the text, the theory of local texts propounded by F.M. Cross is not particularly prominent (186-187 and 316). Rather than local texts, Tov argues for "vulgar texts" and "nonvulgar texts". The eventual dominance of a particular nonvulgar text is the outcome of political and socio-religious factors. "Those who fostered it probably constituted the only organized group which survived the destruction of the Second Temple" (195). Tov's judgement on the Jamnia issue is measured, recognising the place it has in modern scholarship but pointing out the paucity of evidence concerning what, if anything, took place at Jamnia/Jabneh. Whether or not one agrees with all of the positions adopted or with conclusions drawn by Tov, this section on the development of the text is superb. By remaining close to the evidence, and pointing out areas where speculation has become consensus, Tov provides a solid base on which more can be built.

It would be unreasonable to expect that all sections of the book would be equally finely tuned. The treatment of the revisions of the Septuagint

seems particularly brief. The same was the case in the earlier work *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem 1981, Excursus 4, 213-216). The mention of the additional early revisions discovered during this century on p. 147 is very brief, and the reader will easily miss it as it is only barely distinguished from the comments on Symmachus. Again, the treatment of the Vulgate may be misleading for the student (153).

If section three on the history of the text is speculative, the following section on the "Copying and Transmitting of the Biblical Text" (199-285) is comprehensive, clear and detailed, and provides the first such study which takes into account the Dead Sea Scroll material. There is sufficient material to base a study on texts created before the second century CE. The study of variants created in other periods is suitably brief.

In section three, Tov takes a particular stance with regard to the aims of textual criticism maintaining that "the biblical books in their final and canonical edition [...] are the objective of textual criticism" (189). This final and canonical edition corresponds in Tov's view to the *Urtext* posited by de Lagarde for all Biblical books. The contribution of de Lagarde is recognised (165). This particular stance is further developed and justified in chapter five "The Aim and Procedures of Textual Criticism" (287-291). The placing of this short section at this point in the book will seem strange to some, yet it is a hinge point in the book. Its statements are based on data of chapter 4 and on other analytic statements of earlier chapters. It is precisely because the characteristic features of the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible are not commonly agreed or sufficiently distinguished from the textual criticism of other texts that it is necessary to arrange the material in this fashion.

Once the aim of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible is fixed as "the biblical books in their final and canonical edition", textual criticism is limited to the readings created during textual transmission of that text. Tov believes that all readings created in the course of textual transmission ought to be evaluated (295). The guidelines/rules for textual evaluation elaborated with an eye to classical and New Testament texts have their place here.

What then of other readings created in earlier stages of textual transmission? Textual evaluation is not appropriate where we are dealing with different literary strata. The familiar distinction of literary and textual criticism is examined again. Facile clarity is avoided. Different literary strata are to be recognised in the texts, and the *partial* substitution of earlier authoritative "editions" by later "revised editions" led to the co-existence of different editions, which are not to be reduced to one edition by textual criticism. "In our view it is the task of textual (and literary) analysis to aim at that literary composition which has been accepted as binding (authoritative) by Jewish tradition, since these disciplines are concerned with the literary compositions contained in the traditional Hebrew Bible" (317). Tov discusses the issues in regard to several texts (e.g. Jeremiah, Joshua, Ezekiel, 1 Sam 16-18, Proverbs, Genesis). The development of this way of using textual witnesses in literary criticism is earnestly to be hoped for.

We agree with Tov to a great extent, but would add that in our view his definition of the task of textual criticism is incomplete. Certainly one of the most urgent aims of textual criticism must be the study of that literary composition accepted as binding by Jewish tradition. A study of earlier or alternative forms of that text remains valid, and the data should be provided in some way in an edition. Perhaps we should move away from a notion of textual criticism as the quest for one particular form of the text, however that be defined, and turn to a notion of a study of textual history, in which the development of the text in different forms in different circumstances may be brought to light.

Tov narrows the term emendation to "the suggestion (invention) of new readings which are not transmitted in the witnesses of the Biblical text," i.e. what is elsewhere referred to as "conjectural emendation". This change in terminology results from a change in balance in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. We are now more conscious of the Masoretic text as representing one of several textual traditions of earlier periods. Tov suggests that we should relate to the Biblical text as a "large abstract entity" (352). In this perspective, the comparison and selection of readings already existing in textual witnesses but outside of the Masoretic text is not an emendation. However, it is difficult to see how the more traditional use of the terms "emendation" and "conjectural" can be avoided for as long as critical editions of the Masoretic text, such as BHK, BHS and its successor are diplomatic rather than eclectic in approach. The classification of such [conjectural] emendations into contextual, linguistic and metrical is useful (357-369).

A brief section on Critical Editions ends the book somewhat abruptly, without general conclusions. This may be appropriate given the current state of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Yet some more evaluation of the editions would have been useful, as would some indication of future plans for the publication of the Hebrew University Bible. There are thirty plates, and these are followed by indices of Ancient Sources, Authors, and Subjects.

This work is a mine of information, and will find its true place on study bookshelves where it will be available for constant reference. Some aspects of this book will be controversial, and some may feel that insufficient weight is given to views with which Tov disagrees. Perhaps it is in this context that the omission of the word "Introduction" from the title is significant.

School of Hebrew, Biblical,  
and Theological Studies  
Trinity College, Dublin

Gerard J. NORTON O.P.

David M. GUNN—Danna NOLAN FEWELL, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible* (The Oxford Bible Series). Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993. XVI-263 p. 13,5 × 20. £35.00

Cet ouvrage se place dans la longue série des essais sur la narration biblique qui ont fleuri depuis une bonne dizaine d'années. Il se veut plus ample que ceux de R. Alter et A. Berlin, car il se propose d'examiner davantage de techniques narratives. Il est moins théorique que le manuel de S. Bar-Efrat, moins diffus et plus accessible que les études de M. Sternberg. Il intègre aussi quelques nouvelles idées, spécialement les apports des lectures féministes et déconstructionnistes. Enfin, du point de vue herméneutique, les auteurs rompent avec les positions de la lecture historico-critique et de sa recherche de «l'unique sens exact» (7-8) pour adopter une stratégie dictée en grande partie par le *New Criticism*, le *Reader Response Criticism*, l'inter-textualité et le déconstructionnisme déjà cité. Ils privilégient donc la forme finale du texte; ils renoncent à chercher quel peut être le «sens original» et «objectif», car le sens est polysémique et les significations que chaque interprète découvre sont indissociables du contexte subjectif dans lequel il les découvre; enfin, comme les disciples de Derrida, ils estiment qu'un texte est instable parce qu'il contient toujours en lui-même les germes de sa propre négation, et l'interprète est en droit de se demander ce que le récit supprime pour affirmer et détruit pour construire. En ce qui concerne la narration elle-même, ils la définissent d'abord à partir de trois éléments qui à leurs yeux sont essentiels: les personnages («characters»), la trame («plot») et le jeu du langage («word-play»).

Les neuf chapitres alternent les exposés plus systématiques et les applications pratiques. Ainsi nous trouvons une brève histoire de l'interprétation à propos de Gn 4, partant de Philon d'Alexandrie pour aboutir à deux études sud-africaines (Boesak et Mosala) (c. 1). Le deuxième chapitre offre une analyse de Gn 38 (Juda et Tamar) qui, selon la tradition du *New Criticism*, fourmille d'ambiguïtés et d'ironie. Le troisième est plus théorique. Il s'occupe des personnages et de la trame («Characters and Plot») et contient, entre autres, de nombreuses réflexions sur la façon dont le narrateur intervient dans le récit, sur la présence de «narrateurs mystificateurs» («unreliable narrators») dans la Bible et sur le caractère du «personnage» YHWH, beaucoup moins transparent qu'on ne pourrait le croire. Ensuite, les auteurs passent à une analyse du cycle d'Abraham et de Sarah; ils y tracent un portrait d'Abraham sans aucune complaisance. Le cinquième chapitre traite de la trame et de ses variations. La partie la plus originale, à notre avis, est celle qui analyse la difficulté de cerner la fin d'un récit. Suit une lecture du livre de Jonas (c. 6) qui insiste sur les inconnues d'une trame livrant à contrecœur ses clés. Le c. 7 passe en revue quelques aspects principaux du style narratif biblique («The Lure of Language»). Le chapitre suivant est une sorte d'application de ces principes au texte de Dn 3, où la rhétorique du pouvoir et l'ironie sont omniprésentes. Le tout se clôture par quelques réflexions plus générales sur le rôle du lecteur («Readers and Responsibility»), surtout à partir des problèmes inhérents à l'interprétation de Gn 2-3. La bibliographie est subdivisée par sujets et le volume est accompagné des index d'usage.



S'il n'est sans doute pas facile de découvrir une unité dans le contenu, elle existe certainement dans l'intention et la méthode de l'ouvrage. C'est ici sans doute que la discussion avec les auteurs sera la plus intéressante. Elle portera surtout, à notre avis, sur la tendance à privilégier le côté subjectif, psychologique et moral des narrations, tout comme l'ambiguïté fondamentale du langage. Cette façon de voir renouvelle agréablement la lecture de maints textes. Cependant, il n'est pas sûr qu'elle ne pose des problèmes dans certains cas et qu'il ne faille, en fin de compte, revoir certains présupposés de la méthode.

Tout d'abord, il est sans doute bon de se rappeler ce mot malicieux cité par T. Todorov et qui caractérise les excès de certaines écoles: «Le texte n'est qu'un pique-nique où l'auteur apporte les mots et les lecteurs le sens». Or, comment éviter d'en arriver là? Si les lecteurs sont toujours influencés par leur contexte, il faut aussitôt ajouter que les textes aussi sont liés à leur contexte, quel qu'il soit et de quelque façon qu'on veuille le définir. Pourquoi ne tenir compte que du contexte des lecteurs (et des lectrices)? D'autre part, tout en admettant que les interprétations puissent varier, il n'en reste pas moins vrai que chaque texte dit «quelque chose» et que l'interprète ne peut donc pas lui faire dire n'importe quoi. Avec U. Eco, il est donc important de fixer «les limites de l'interprétation» (*The Limits of Interpretation* [Bloomington 1990]; voir également ses contributions à l'ouvrage *Interpretation and overinterpretation* [ed. S. Collini; Cambridge 1992]). Il est utile aussi de s'interroger sur les critères de validité devant le foisonnement des interprétations, comme le faisait déjà E. D. Hirsch (*Validity in Interpretation* [New Haven – London 1967]). Car, à la limite, on finit par dire que tous les sens se valent, en excluant, bien sûr, celui qui était «voulu» par l'auteur et celui qui pourrait prétendre être normatif. Cependant, s'il est possible de découvrir plusieurs sens à un même texte, faut-il dire aussi qu'ils sont tous d'égale valeur? Le dialogue entre interprètes ne suppose-t-il pas une «intention d'objectivité» dans la lecture? Quelques exemples vont le montrer.

Dans l'histoire de Juda et Tamar (Gn 38), les auteurs insistent à juste titre sur le comportement assez vil de Juda. Ils affirment entre autres que Juda cherche encore à sauver les apparences lorsqu'il dit que Tamar est «plus juste» que lui, ce qui signifie qu'une part de justice lui revient aussi (Gn 38,26; cf. p. 43). Mais, en fait, bien des exégètes préfèrent une autre traduction: «Tamar est juste et moi non» (Voir GK 133b, n. 3; J. P. Fokkelman, *The Crossing Fates* [SSN 23; Assen 1986] 469, n. 47). Le texte parallèle de 2 S 24,18 ne laisse aucun doute à ce sujet, comme le montre le v. 18b. Tout le récit de Gn 38 est basé sur l'ironie et la différence de perspective. Lorsque, en fin de compte, Juda, qui ignore, comme le lecteur, le stratagème inventé par Tamar, doit reconnaître la «justice» de l'héroïne, ce même lecteur ne peut qu'en faire autant. S'il y a jugement dans ce texte, il est dans la bouche de Juda qui se juge lui-même en même temps qu'il innocent Tamar. Dans ce cas précis, la lexicographie et la traduction du texte sont dirimantes par rapport à certaines interprétations.

Dans le récit de Jonas, les auteurs basent une bonne partie de leur exégèse sur la correspondance entre Jon 4,2 et Ex 34,6-7. La formule pour dé-

crire la miséricorde de Dieu est presque identique des deux côtés. D'autre part, les auteurs soulignent quelques contradictions dans le texte de Jon. Ne faut-il pas douter de la profondeur de la conversion de Ninive décrite au c. 3 (140)? Le Dieu de la miséricorde (Ex 34,6) est aussi le Dieu qui fait retomber la faute des pères sur les fils (Ex 34,7). De ce fait, le désir de vengeance et de jugement n'est pas un monopole de Jonas, et Ninive pourrait en faire l'expérience. A cette exégèse, on peut objecter que Jon 4,2 ne cite pas exactement Ex 34,6, mais plutôt la formule de J1 2,13. Ceci est confirmé par le fait que le roi de Ninive emploie en Jon 3,9 une formule qui apparaît, telle quelle, en J1 2,13. De part et d'autre, il est d'ailleurs question de conversion et de rites de pénitence. Cette fois, l'interprétation dépend en grande partie de l'identification d'une référence biblique.

Dans leur analyse de Jg 11,29-40 (112-119), les auteurs considèrent que la fille de Jephthé juge son père (116-117). En venant au-devant de lui, elle lui dévoile la cruauté de son vœu. En lui demandant de passer deux mois avec ses compagnes et non avec lui, elle montre qu'elle refuse son obsession de la gloire et son goût pour la violence. Cette lecture est certainement possible. Cependant, il y a peu d'éléments dans le texte pour la supporter. En effet, le « point de vue » adopté par le narrateur est purement externe lorsqu'il s'agit des personnages. Nous ne savons rien de leurs sentiments, sauf lorsqu'ils parlent. De plus, seul le lecteur est en fait au courant du vœu prononcé par Jephthé (11,30) et c'est pourquoi il est dans une position privilégiée pour pouvoir participer au drame, puisqu'il peut anticiper la réaction du père et de sa fille. Comment cette dernière devine ce que son père a promis reste une énigme. En fait, le lecteur sait, et cela suffit pour qu'il comprenne le drame. A notre avis, c'est ce point-là qui mérite d'être souligné: le récit fait tout pour inviter à une participation au drame de deux personnages pris dans un piège dont il ne peuvent plus se délivrer. C'est une tragédie qui, une fois déclenchée, est irréversible. Jephthé comme sa fille réagissent en conséquence sans émettre de « jugements » qui, selon les conventions du récit, ne pourraient rien changer à la dure réalité des faits. La seule réaction mentionnée par le récit est celle des filles d'Israël; elle est d'une sobriété exemplaire et peut difficilement être assimilée à un jugement (11,40).

A ce propos, il semble opportun de noter une autre difficulté de l'exégèse narrative de nos auteurs: leur interprétation se fait volontiers « morale ». Ils avouent eux-mêmes, après leur lecture de l'histoire de David, que « the end of our reading is full of judgments – not least our own value judgments » (173). Plus loin, ils diront encore: « We have been conditioned to relate to the heroes and to look at them for examples for living our own lives » (192). La lecture enlève certaines illusions à ce sujet, comme l'annonçait déjà l'introduction. A l'école du déconstructionnisme, ils finissent toujours par enlever les auréoles et à faire descendre des piédestals. Même l'image de YHWH n'échappe pas à cette narratologie du soupçon (81-89). Mais faut-il suivre les auteurs dans cette lecture éthique et souvent « judiciaire » des textes? Nous ne voulons en aucune façon suggérer qu'ils ont tort de faire tomber les masques. Au contraire, il faut leur en savoir gré. Le problème se situe à un autre plan, celui de l'herméneutique. Ne faut-il pas, comme le dit U. Eco, s'interroger d'abord sur l'« intention du texte »? La

trame est-elle toujours secondaire par rapport au portrait des personnages? Les récits bibliques nous proposent-ils si souvent des «exemples à suivre»? Exemples, d'ailleurs que nous sommes en droit de refuser. Nous avons de bonnes raisons de penser que la réponse à ces questions n'est pas toujours évidente. Déjà les textes bibliques font apparaître au grand jour les déficiences des héros de la Genèse comme de ceux des autres récits. Même Moïse n'est pas épargné. En fait, ces personnages sont avant tout des ancêtres et ils restent des ancêtres, qu'ils soient parfaits ou non. Ce sont les fondateurs du peuple d'Israël, qui ont modelé l'histoire et la mémoire collective d'un peuple. Les récits sont régis davantage par un «principe de réalité» que par un «principe de moralité». Il suffit d'ailleurs de comparer les récits bibliques avec les annales royales de Mésopotamie ou d'Égypte pour comprendre qu'ils s'agit de deux mondes différents. Nos auteurs peuvent juger Abraham, David et même la figure de YHWH, parce que les textes bibliques n'ont pas fait grand-chose pour les embellir ou pour cacher leurs contradictions. De quel roi d'Égypte, de Mésopotamie ou d'Ugarit a-t-on raconté quelque chose de semblable à ce que nous lisons en 2 S 11-12? Dans quel poème du Proche-Orient ancien un dieu se laisse-t-il interpellé comme le Dieu de Job? Nous ne cherchons pas à «récupérer» la Bible ou à démontrer par un autre biais sa supériorité. Nous voulons dire qu'en Israël a triomphé un esprit critique peu commun et que cet esprit critique tient en grande partie au «réalisme» des écrivains d'Israël, pour employer un terme cher à E. Auerbach. Et si le «déconstructionnisme» peut s'en donner à cœur joie dans sa lecture de la Bible, c'est parce que celle-ci a déjà opéré une déconstruction ou une démythologisation de la plupart de ses personnages.

Cet esprit réaliste des narrations bibliques entraîne un corollaire important. Les récits distinguent deux axes dans leur présentation des faits. D'une part, ils informent sur les événements et leurs conséquences. D'autre part, ils orientent le lecteur dans ses sympathies ou ses antipathies. Autrement dit, le jugement sur les faits est distinct du jugement sur la moralité des actes. Un bel exemple est donné par M. Sternberg à propos de Gn 27. Du point de vue de la trame, il est certain que le récit fait de Jacob l'héritier de la promesse et rien ne pourra y changer quoi que ce soit. Du point de vue moral, par contre, le récit suggère nettement qu'il désapprouve la façon dont la bénédiction a été obtenue. De ce fait, Ésaü a toute la sympathie du lecteur et nul ne s'étonne qu'un jour la *nemesis* atteigne Jacob. Le plan de l'information est différent de celui de la sympathie, le récit a donc aussi deux sommets, l'un factuel (27,27-29), l'autre émotionnel (27,34.39-40), et il n'est pas possible de les confondre. Voir M. Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington 1985) 164-165. Ceci n'est sans doute qu'une autre façon de détecter les points de vue divergents qui sous-tendent les récits et qui sont chers au déconstructionnisme.

Ces quelques réflexions critiques, qui consistent surtout en une différente appréciation des paramètres objectifs de l'interprétation et du caractère réaliste des récits bibliques, sont avant tout la preuve de l'intérêt que nous avons pris à la lecture de cet ouvrage.

Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Roma

Jean Louis SKA

*La Bible d'Alexandrie. Le Deutéronome.* Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Cécile DOGNIEZ et Marguerite HARL. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 364 p. 20 × 14. FF 185

Con questo volume sta per essere completata la traduzione francese della Tôrà nella versione dei LXX, preparata dal centro Lenain de Tillemont della Sorbona sotto la direzione di M. Harl. La stessa Harl ha curato traduzione, introduzione e note della Genesi, apparsa nel 1986 e, in questo volume, la prima parte dell'introduzione al Deuteronomio (*Le Deutéronome grec, son traducteur, ses lecteurs*», 19-73) e le note ai capitoli 12-34. La traduzione è frutto della collaborazione della Harl con C. Dogniez, che ha steso la seconda parte della Introduzione («L'ordre et le contenu des discours, les paroles répétées», 75-103) e le note ai capitoli 1-11.

Il criterio seguito è il medesimo degli altri volumi: le autrici avvertono che le note non esauriscono tutte le informazioni che si potrebbero offrire e che l'apparato critico dell'edizione di Göttingen curata dal Wevers (J. W. Wevers [ed.] *Deuteronomium*, 'Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum' Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum III, 2 [Göttingen 1977]) è stato utilizzato non sistematicamente a causa della sua ricchezza di dati. Alla stessa stregua solo per alcuni versetti si è fatto ricorso alle tradizioni giudaiche (*Targumîm* e letteratura rabbinica).

La cura e l'attenzione delle autrici sono state rivolte, come era giusto in questo caso, alla spiegazione dei termini greci, al confronto con il testo massoretico quando utile e, infine, alla lettura del Deuteronomio greco fatta dai Padri.

Nel caso di termini o passi che richiedevano un commento od osservazioni già fatte allo stesso proposito nei volumi precedenti si è operato un semplice rimando. La cosa vale soprattutto per l'Esodo (curato da A. Le Boulluec e P. Sandevor, apparso nel 1989).

La versione del Deuteronomio, posta ad Alessandria agli inizi del III sec. a.C. (19), insiste sull'importanza dello studio della Tôrà come trasmissione scritta delle parole di Mosé. Questo si rileva dal titolo del libro, da alcune scelte lessicali e da certe interpretazioni significative.

La lunga introduzione preposta alla traduzione del testo e le note relative intendono mostrare l'originalità del Deuteronomio dei LXX rispetto a quello del TM. La prima parte dell'introduzione spiega e confronta le due denominazioni, ebraica e greca, dell'ultimo libro del Pentateuco (19-28), illustra le caratteristiche della versione greca e le differenze rispetto al testo ebraico (29-40), esamina la resa in greco dei temi tipici del libro (40-63) ed il lessico usato (63-68), infine menziona le fonti più antiche, giudaiche e cristiane, che citano il Deuteronomio greco (68-73).

La versione appare abbastanza letterale e abbastanza buona come forma greca (il traduttore segue l'ordine delle parole e mantiene lo stesso numero di termini, riproduce le articolazioni e la paratassi della proposizione ebraica, opera calchi di costruzione e conserva le costruzioni preposizionali con parti del corpo, si serve spesso del medesimo vocabolo greco per rende-

re lo stesso ebraico) e si discosta dall'ebraico per motivi letterari, ma non in modo sistematico; i *plures* sono molto più frequenti delle lacune, soprattutto rispetto all'edizione del Rahlfs, che presenta un testo più ricco di quello scelto dal Wevers, il quale si fonda essenzialmente sul P. Fouad 266 della metà del I sec. a.C.

Quando LXX e TM divergono, come sempre sono possibili ipotesi differenti, tra le quali è difficile scegliere la più probabile: originale ebraico diverso, errore di lettura, modifica di tipo letterario, interpretazione libera di passo oscuro, mutamento deliberato del testo.

Per quanto concerne il lessico parecchi termini tardivi sono attestati nelle opere degli storici di età ellenistica e romana, e vocaboli apparentemente rari compaiono nei documenti su papiro: in genere esso presenta parecchie innovazioni e calchi di termini tecnici (elencati alle p. 64-66). Le innovazioni sono per lo più costituite da forme composte, di cui la forma semplice è già in uso, talune presenti solo qui nei LXX. Il traduttore: «donne la préférence aux termes de *morale* et de *justice*, lorsqu'il s'agit des devoirs de l'homme, et aux termes *affectifs* pour décrire la bienveillance du Seigneur pour Israël» (63).

La seconda parte dell'introduzione illustra la struttura del Deuteronomio nella versione greca (75-85) e le suddivisioni liturgiche del libro (85-88); elenca le frasi stereotipe del testo greco (88-90) e la versione dei nomi geografici (91-100); termina con la presentazione delle edizioni del testo dei LXX e dei suoi testimoni (100-103) e con una interessante ed utile sinossi dei passi paralleli di Esodo, Levitico, Numeri, Deuteronomio (103-107). L'interesse e l'importanza degli argomenti trattati nell'Introduzione appare a chiunque abbia un po' di esperienza nell'affrontare i problemi connessi con la versione dei LXX.

Tanto l'Introduzione quanto le note (su cui ci soffermeremo più sotto) sono frutto di un paziente lavoro di studio e di ricerca da parte delle autrici, che, come si è già detto in altra sede presentando altri volumi della medesima collana, rendono più prezioso il contributo scientifico offerto dalla traduzione in lingua moderna del testo greco.

Traduzione e note occupano quasi 250 pagine (112-357) e le note sono composte in un carattere molto ridotto per risparmiare spazio: anche questi dati numerici provano la dovizie di osservazioni, soprattutto di carattere lessicale, offerte sul testo in esame e sull'ambiente culturale da cui è sorto.

Molti sono gli spunti di ricerca che si traggono dalle note, soprattutto di tipo lessicale e semantico, per verificare se alcuni termini sono attestati nei documenti su papiro, specie di recente scoperta, e con quale accezione. È il caso, per fare solo qualche esempio di παραβιάζω (1,43, p. 121) «usar violenza» verbo raro nei LXX, corradicale di βία, termine tecnico per indicare un delitto a metà fra il delitto contro la persona e quello contro la proprietà, quale troviamo specificato nelle petizioni di età tolemaica accanto alla ὕβρις, delitto di violenza contro la persona e alla διώσεις, l'estorsione di un tributo illegale da parte di un funzionario (cf. R. Taubenschlag, *The Laws of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri* 332 B.C.-640 A.D. [Warszawa 1955] 438-450). In questo passo secondo il Caird («Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint» II, *JTS* 20 [1969] 21-40, 27 n° 86) il verbo indi-

cherebbe «fare qualcosa contro gli ordini». È anche il caso di ἐγκληρος (4,20, p. 140) *hapax* nei LXX con un senso forse attivo «chi riceve la sua parte di eredità», o passivo, che lo farebbe equivalere ad ἐπίκληρος «che riceve in eredità»; di φορολόγητος «passibile di tributo» *hapax* di 20,11 (240) formato dal verbo tardo φορολογεῖν «pagare in tributo»; varrebbe la pena di studiare con attenzione l'evoluzione semantica di φόρος «tributo» per accertare se esso assuma anche nei papiri il senso di «lavoro forzato» che appare in 2 Re 9,21, e dei suoi corradicali come φορολόγος «esattore di tributo», occorrente 6 volte nei LXX (2 in Gb) di cui 4 in libri giuntici solo nella versione greca (2 Esd, 1 Mac), che in Gb 3,18 pare avere l'accezione di «aguzzino» (cf. anche G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*. I Book of Job [Lunds Universitets Årsskrift 43,2; Lund 1946] 36-37). Uno studio meriterebbe il lessico delle malattie menzionate nel cap. 28.

Tra le notizie interessanti è da annoverare quella sull'origine del termine latino *talio* (236) da cui l'italiano «talione», per classificare la norma giuridica che sancisce il diritto di trarre risarcimento da un danno subito infliggendo il medesimo danno al colpevole. Tale norma, presente nei codici legislativi del Vicino Oriente Antico (Hammurapi, per esempio), è citata in Dt 19,21 con la formula «vita per vita, occhio per occhio, dente per dente, mano per mano, piede per piede».

In Lv 24,20, dopo un'enumerazione simile, ma più breve, «frattura (σύντριμμα) per frattura, occhio per occhio, dente per dente» il greco dice καθότι ἂν δῶ μῶμον τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, οὕτως δοθήσεται αὐτῷ reso dalla Vulgata *qualem inflixerit maculam talem sustinere cogetur*. Dalla presenza dell'aggettivo *talis* nelle formule di questo tipo sarebbe derivato il sostantivo *talio*.

Agli inizi del cap. 20 (vv. 5-8) si trovano elencati i motivi di esenzione dalla guerra, ripresi parzialmente in 1 Mac 3,56. I primi tre riguardano opere intraprese ma non condotte a termine (costruire una casa, piantare una vigna, essere fidanzato) e vengono connessi con le tre categorie di rifiuto opposte all'invito al banchetto in Lc 14,18-20 (acquisto di un campo, di un paio di buoi, matrimonio) (236-237).

È molto bella l'immagine che si trova in 8,3 espressa dal verbo ψωμίζω, avente per soggetto Dio. Il Signore mette in bocca pezzetti di cibo, bocconi di nutrimento al suo popolo. Il medesimo verbo è usato da Aristotele nell'*Historia animalium* 8,2 per esprimere l'azione di porre grani nel becco degli uccelli: oltre all'idea del nutrimento vengono così sottintese, mi sembra, la cura e la tenerezza con cui si rende il cibo adatto ad essere assunto, come si fa con un essere fragile ed inesperto quale un bambino o un uccellino.

Per la triste attualità del problema va ricordata l'occorrenza del sostantivo βδέλυγμα «nausea, vomito» in 7,25 (167), che è usato anche altrove nei LXX, per un totale di circa cinquanta volte, perché ha con probabilità influito sull'adozione del termine, e del suo corradicale βδελύσσομαι «provo la nausea per, mi viene da vomitare» per esprimere, sia pur metamorficamente, una reazione di ripulsa, e quindi costituire un documento di antisemitismo, nei confronti degli Ebrei. I vocaboli di origine medica (Hippocrates, *De morbis mulierum*, 1,39,41) appaiono impiegati in un contesto diverso, di carattere morale. Già in Es 1,12 si dice che gli Egiziani provavano

nausea nei confronti degli Ebrei e una lettera privata del I sec. a.C. proveniente da Memphis in cui si chiede ospitalità per un sacerdote, quasi certamente ebreo, proveniente da Tebtynis, afferma: «tu sai che gli Ebrei danno loro la nausea» (CPJud I, 141; cf. J. Méléze Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs d'Égypte*. De Ramsès II à Hadrien [Paris 1991] 128-130).

Senza prendere troppo spazio in più, si sarebbe potuto in qualche caso rendere più completa l'informazione aggiungendo un dato come a p.171 nota a 8,9, dove si dice *πρωξεία*, *hapax* nel Pentateuco, corrisponde a un *hapax* della Bibbia ebraica senza darne la traslitterazione (*miskēnut*). Il vocabolo, corradicale del termine babilonese *muškinu* «povero», è interessante perché connesso con il nostro «meschino» (attraverso l'arabo *miskīn*). Un altro esempio è a p. 263 a proposito di ἐκτοκίζω (23,20) «esigere interesse» *hapax* nei LXX, che si dice attestato in un papiro del III sec. a.C.: l'aggiunta della citazione (BGU VI 1246,24) sarebbe stata utile per un riscontro, trattandosi di un'unica citazione (almeno secondo il LSJ).

Il comandamento di munire di parapetto la terrazza (22,8, p.251) si ritrova anche nel Rotolo del Tempio (11QTS 65, 5b-7a) con una variante rispetto al TM: questo parla di «tuo tetto» (che i LXX rendono «tua casa») mentre RT ha «suo tetto» quindi presuppone una persona che edifichi una casa per un'altra (cf. A. Vivian [a cura di], *Rotolo del Tempio* [Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 6. Letteratura giudaica 1; Brescia 1990] 129-234).

L'espressione greca συγγραφὴ ἀποστασίου, letteralmente «scritto di rinuncia», presente in 24,3 per rendere l'ebraico *sēfer kēritūt* a proposito del divorzio, è sorta come traduzione dell'equivalente demotico per indicare il documento attestante la rinuncia a vantare qualsiasi sul bene venduto da parte del venditore e il riconoscimento della proprietà del compratore.

I papiri che ci sono giunti con atti di divorzio fra Ebrei (o samaritani, come P. Herm. Rees 29 del 586 d.C.) usano, a partire dal IV sec. d.C. (e fino al VI) il termine *ῥεπούδιον*, calco del latino *repudium*. Dalla documentazione papiristica abbiamo attestazioni dell'assunzione di prassi giuridica greca da parte degli Ebrei della diaspora egiziana, prassi che poteva contravvenire le regole della normativa giudaica. Stando ai precetti del Deuteronomio in ambito matrimoniale e commerciale si possono richiamare il caso del contratto di matrimonio contenuto nel P Yadin 18 del 5 aprile 128 d.C. rinvenuto a Naḥal Ḥever (N. Lewis-R. Katzoff-J.C. Greenfield, «Papyrus Yadin 18», *IEJ* 37 [1987] 229-250, 230-238-239) e quello dei due contratti di prestito ad interesse tra Ebrei, nonostante il divieto espresso in Dt 23,20-21 (CPJud I,20 da Tebtynis, 228-221 a.C.; CPJud I,24, da Trikomia nell'Ar-sinoite, 16 aprile 174 a.C., rinnovo di prestito). Questi ed altri esempi del genere si possono tuttavia conformare col principio legislativo talmudico formulato definitivamente nel III sec. a.C. «la legge dello stato (governante) è legge» (*dyn' dmlkw' dyn'*).

Come già per i precedenti volumi ringraziamo i realizzatori di questa meritevole impresa di traduzione della Bibbia dei LXX e, nel caso particolare, le due autrici, per il loro prezioso lavoro volto a far conoscere un testimone del testo veterotestamentario così antico e così affascinante.

Viale Toscana, 11  
I-20136 Milano

Anna Passoni DELL'ACQUA

## Novum Testamentum

JOHN T. SQUIRES, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts* (SNTS Monograph Series 76). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993. x-233 p. 14,5 × 22. £30.00

This monograph, a revision of the author's 1988 Yale University dissertation, seeks to illuminate the important theme of the plan of God in Luke-Acts by placing it in comparative perspective. Since Squires believes that Luke-Acts belongs to the genre of history, he turns to Hellenistic historians for comparative material and focuses especially on Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Josephus. Squires studies the role that providence plays in the work of each of these authors, and in Luke-Acts. His inquiry is broad, for he not only takes account of the various Greek terms that may refer to providence but divides his theme into five strands: "the primary strand of providence, how God is at work in history"; divine interventions (portents, miracles); epiphanies; prophecies; and "the divine necessity of certain key events" (10). Each of these strands becomes a chapter in which Squires investigates Diodorus, Dionysius, Josephus, and then Luke-Acts. This investigation is preceded by two preliminary chapters and followed by a conclusion.

Squires' discussion is detailed and informative. For instance, in discussing providence in the works of Diodorus and Dionysius, he notes signs of their awareness of the debate between Stoics and Epicureans over providence, indicates how appeals to providence may function apologetically, and considers the relation between providence and Fortune (38-46). Many of the footnotes discuss word usage by the respective authors. Some scholars may find these footnotes quite helpful, and there is an index of Greek words as a guide to this material. Sometimes, however, lists of the occurrences of a word substitute for needed analysis. Thus on p. 166, n. 60, Squires lists the various incidents in the *Antiquitates* which Josephus ascribes to the activity of God through using the word *θεῖ* but Squires does not discuss the nuances of this word in Josephus' usage.

Although Josephus is the chief representative of Judaism in Squires' study, there are some references in footnotes to other literature of Hellenistic Judaism. There are also fairly frequent references to the discussions of providence in Greco-Roman philosophy.

While acknowledging that both Josephus and Luke are strongly influenced by the Jewish Bible, Squires believes that Luke shows the influence of Hellenistic historiography and, indirectly, of Stoic philosophy. Thus he says, "The understanding of providence which informs Luke's use of the theme of the plan of God might be called a basically Stoic understanding, moderated for popular consumption in the manner of the historians" (189). Squires, however, also suggests some significant points of difference between Luke and the Hellenistic historians. In Luke-Acts "the God of Israel exercises a consistent providential guidance", which contrasts with the capricious Fortune that mixes with providence in



Diodorus and Dionysius (67, cf. 43-46). Oracles play a role in Hellenistic histories, but there is "a difference of intensity" in Luke-Acts; "the place of prophecies in Luke-Acts is far more significant" (153). Furthermore, in Luke-Acts "the scope and nature of the plan of God exceeds... the role of providence in the histories of Diodorus and Dionysius" (77), and the work of God is "contrary to... traditional religious beliefs", while "the gods were understood to intervene in favour of the *status quo* in hellenistic histories" (118, cf. 146).

The importance of the plan of God in Luke-Acts justifies the special attention that Squires gives to it in this study. His work could be carried further, however, through fuller appreciation of the literary function of the plan of God in the narrative, clearer recognition of the content of God's plan, and discussion of the ironic way it is realized. The central importance of the plan of God appears when we ask what unifies this long narrative. Narratives are commonly unified by a dominant purpose. Events are chosen for inclusion in the narrative because they represent movement toward fulfillment of this purpose or disclose obstacles that must be overcome. In Luke-Acts no human character remains the central actor throughout. The one purpose of sufficient scope to give meaning to all of the events in Luke-Acts is the plan of God. To help readers understand the significance of individual events, the narrator orients us to the plan of God early in the narrative. Already in Luke 2,30-32 and 3,6 we are told that God's purpose is salvation and that this salvation must encompass both Jews and Gentiles. The rest of the narrative should be read in light of this disclosure, which enables us to understand the significance of following events. Squires discusses the Lucan birth narrative, but when he later refers to the content of God's plan, he thinks primarily of the death of Jesus and the Gentile mission. These are important but are part of something greater. It is the overarching divine purpose of salvation that defines the significance of all events in the story, which represent obstacles and forward movement in the realization of this purpose.

Squires emphasizes the apologetic purpose of Luke-Acts, in a broad sense of this term that encompasses defense, polemic, and exposition of one's views (40). Luke's apologetic must deal not only with the death of Jesus and the Gentile mission, issues that Squires recognizes, but also with a charge of anti-Judaism. This charge is highlighted in Acts 21,21.28 and gives rise to a whole series of defense speeches by Paul. As late as Acts 28,17-20 Paul is still speaking to this charge. Squires narrows the scope of Luke's apologetic when he ascribes Luke's emphasis on the fulfillment of Jewish Scripture and on Paul's Jewishness to a desire to prove the antiquity of this seemingly new movement (193). Rather, Luke is dealing with an issue that arises from his understanding of the plan of God. Luke recognizes that Scripture contains promises to the Jewish people. This shapes Luke's definition of the purpose of God, which must include salvation for Jews as well as Gentiles. Yet the rejection of the gospel by many Jews, and their deep suspicion, especially of Paul, stands in the way of this purpose. Thus the charges of anti-Judaism against Paul must be addressed.

The Lucan interpretation of the plan of God is not derived from Scripture in any simple fashion; a process of interpretation is involved in which certain passages, understood in certain ways, become central. Nevertheless, Scripture is understood as witness to the plan of God in Luke-Acts. Therefore, careful study of Luke's scriptural interpretation is important for understanding his view of God's plan.

Squires discusses the relation between divine necessity and human free will, recognizing that the former does not eliminate the latter. Although certain things are necessary to realize the divine plan, human opposition is possible and human cooperation is important. Squires does not adequately explain, however, that divine sovereignty is maintained in spite of human opposition through Luke's ironic view of the relation between divine and human action. God's plan is realized not only through human cooperation but also through human rejection, which ironically contributes to the realization of God's purpose. Thus the killing of Jesus can be described both as a human act of rejection, for which people are responsible, and as part of God's plan, since it leads to Jesus' exaltation to the right hand of God. This ironic conjunction between human opposition and the realization of God's purpose is highlighted in Acts 2,23 and 4,27-28, passages discussed by Squires but without sufficient care. Here especially the ironic conjunction between divine action and human opposition is emphasized. Yet puzzles remain. The emphasis in Acts 2,23 and 4,28 on God's plan as predetermined seems to eliminate any dialogical quality that would preserve a significant role for humans, but is this really the Lucan view? The reference in 2,23 to God's *πρόγνῳσις* also deserves attention.

The emphasis on divine necessity (using *δεῖ*) is particularly strong in connection with the death of Jesus. In Luke 24,26-27 the necessity of the Messiah's suffering was explained on the basis of the Scriptures by the risen Christ, we are told, but we, the readers, are left to guess at what was said. The narrator's reticence does not mean, however, that acceptance of the inscrutable divine will must replace understanding. Previous references to the rejection and killing of the prophets (Luke 4,24; 6,22-23; 11,47-51; 13,33-34) suggest that there is a well-known pattern of resistance to God's messengers Jesus' death fits this pattern. This observation enables us to interpret Jesus' death as a dialogical necessity. That is, the necessity arises from human action and divine response. Jesus' death is necessary because the pattern of human resistance stemming from commitments to narrow and selfish goals brings suffering on God's messengers, but this is also a divine necessity because faithfulness until death in face of this resistance is required for the realization of God's purpose. However, does this explanation fit Acts 2,23 and 4,28?

A further example of how the divine plan and human action may relate is found in Acts 27, the story of the storm at sea. Paul must correct his original prophecy of loss of life when he receives the promise that no one on the ship will perish. From this point on the promise becomes the norm for correct action. When first the sailors and then the soldiers are about to save themselves at the expense of others, they are stopped. Human skills, particularly those of the sailors, are needed to realize the promise. The

divine promise has another key role in the narrative: at a crucial point it encourages despondent people to strengthen themselves for action (Acts 27, 22-25. 33-36). Divine action does not replace human action here; rather the prophecy provides a norm for human action and motivates human action.

Squires briefly discusses the references to the apostles and Paul being chosen for their missions and commanded to fulfill them (173-174). Some of the references to divine necessity are directly related to the experience of being called for a special mission (cf. Luke 2,49; 4,43; Acts 9,6; 23,11). Probably the references to the necessity of Jesus' death are to be understood in the same way: the Son of Man "must" suffer and be rejected in order to remain faithful to his mission. In obedient response to God's call, the divine plan and human action coalesce. Because of the importance of obedient human action in these contexts, it is doubtful that Luke's views on divine necessity should be discussed under the heading of "fate", as Squires does in chapter 7.

By these remarks I want not only to encourage further thinking about Luke-Acts but also further investigation of Diodorus, Dionysius, Josephus, and other ancient authors. The closer we look at Luke-Acts the better will be the questions that we can bring to the comparative literature. Thus we can ask whether the Hellenistic historians also have a sense of the ironic conjunction between divine and human action and how they express this. Likewise, we can ask whether the Hellenistic historians, like Luke, connect being called or sent or authorized for a task with divine necessity. Presumably there are differences in the understanding of God between pagans, on the one hand, and Jews and Christians, on the other, that will influence their understanding of providence and the plan of God, but how these differences affect specific issues will need to be checked.

As these remarks indicate, Squires, in my opinion, has provided us with a useful beginning of an investigation that is still unfinished.

960 Braumiller Rd.  
Delaware, OH 43015 USA

Robert C. TANNEHILL

Wolfgang KRAUS, *Der Tod Jesu als Heiligtumsweihe. Eine Untersuchung zum Umfeld der Sühnevorstellung in Römer 3,25-26a* (WMANT 66). Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1991. x-432 p. 15 × 23,5

Il testo di Rom 3,21-26 è sicuramente uno dei vertici della grande lettera paolina, come risulta, oltre che dalla struttura argomentativa dell'intero scritto, anche dalla numerosa letteratura specifica che ad esso è stata dedicata. La sua importanza risiede non soltanto nella dimensione teologica, che lo connota in modo determinante ai fini della ricostruzione della teologia dell'Apostolo, ma anche nei problemi che esso pone a livello di rapporto tra redazione e tradizione e poi nel settore tutt'altro che secondario del suo

sfondo religionista. Il presente lavoro, frutto di una Dissertazione sostenuta alla Facoltà Teologica dell'Università di Erlangen-Nürnberg, si inserisce in maniera originale nella ricerca in materia, adottando una posizione certo nuova e interessante ma, a mio parere, non convincente.

L'Autore, dopo un breve status quaestionis, comincia con l'individuare e lo stabilire il tenore della formula prepaolina, che sta dietro l'attuale testo redazionale. Egli giustamente scarta il v. 24, spesso ritenuto invece almeno parzialmente debitore di una tradizione anteriore, e vi scorge la normale mano di Paolo. Altra cosa è il testo dei vv. 25-26a nei quali individua la presenza di un passo tradizionale, così ricostruito al di là dei ritocchi paolini: *ὁς προετέθη ἱλαστήριον ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ*. In questa ricostruzione è certo accettabile la eliminazione dei complementi «mediante la fede» e «per la manifestazione della sua giustizia», che sono di chiaro timbro paolino; non altrettanto si può dire dell'*incipit*, che senza una ragione sufficiente viene a sostituire l'inizio attuale del passo *ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεός*.

La tesi centrale del volume però viene costruita sull'analisi del termine e del concetto di *ἱλαστήριον*. Il K. ne fa un buon studio lessicografico nelle varie fonti, in cui esso è documentato (testi biblici, l'apocrifo 4 *Macc*, Filone Al., Fl. Giuseppe, le poche attestazioni pagane, e persino quelle cristiane dei primi secoli). Un'attenzione particolare è data al tema della morte espiatoria dei martiri, così come essa è trattata in 2 Mac 7,37-38 e soprattutto in 4 Mac 6,28-29; 17,21-22, per concludere sull'impossibilità di spiegare il passo paolino ricorrendo a questo schema. Questo giudizio negativo mi pare eccessivo per due motivi. L'uno consiste nella sottolinenatura esagerata attribuita alla dimensione del castigo vicario subito dal martire; certo questo aspetto delle cose è assente da Rom 3,25-26, ma anche nei testi studiati è chiaramente accennato appena in 4 Mac 6,28-29, mentre negli altri il castigo è propriamente inflitto al tiranno persecutore. L'altro motivo di perplessità è inerente all'osservazione secondo cui il sacrificio di un uomo è impensabile nell'ottica culturale dell'A.T.; bisognerebbe però precisare che gli autori di 2 Mac e 4 Mac, sia pure eventualmente influenzati dall'ellenismo, sono pur sempre essi stessi dei Giudei in senso pieno e quindi conoscitori del culto giudaico, tanto più che una distinzione netta tra A.T. e altri scritti all'interno della letteratura giudaica all'inizio dell'era cristiana è ancora anacronistica e Paolo conosce e utilizza opere non solo canoniche! (In generale, cf. D. Seeley, *The Noble Death* [JSNTSS 28; Sheffield 1990] 19-37 e 83-112.)

L'Autore espone la sua tesi centrale sulla base di un riferimento alla festa dello *Yôm Kippûr* studiata prevalentemente nel testo di Lev 16, allargato a Ez 43; 45 e alla tradizione giudaica successiva (specie rabbinica). L'analisi della pagina levitica conduce il K. a distinguere nettamente da una parte i due sacrifici del giovenco e del capro espiatorio e dall'altra il rito del capro emissario: i primi due, caratterizzati dalla tipologia del «sacrificio per il peccato» per l'effusione del sangue della vittima, sono finalizzati unicamente a purificare il Tempio dalle impurità causate dai peccati rispettivamente dei sacerdoti e di tutto il popolo; soltanto il secondo, che però di fatto non è un vero sacrificio perché il capro non viene immolato, espia propriamente

per tutte le iniquità e le trasgressioni del popolo d'Israele. Orbene, poiché in Rom 3,25 il concetto di *hilastérion* è espressamente collegato all'idea del sangue, ne risulterebbe che tanto Paolo quanto la tradizione da lui ripresa pensano che la morte di Cristo abbia un rapporto diretto non con i peccati di tutti gli uomini (dato che non c'è alcun riferimento al capro emissario) ma con la purificazione del Tempio escatologico quale era nelle attese di alcuni settori del cosiddetto medio-giudaismo. A questo quadro ermeneutico è ovviamente legata l'interpretazione dei due concetti di *πάρεσις*, inteso come tolleranza e non come remissione, e di *ἀνοχή*, inteso come pazienza e non come magnanimità: il senso è che la morte di Cristo espia finalmente i peccati commessi in precedenza (e solo quelli) per preparare così una degna dimora escatologica a Dio in mezzo al suo nuovo popolo. A questa concezione propria già del testo pre-redazionale Paolo aggiunge di suo il tema della manifestazione della giustizia salvifica di Dio e dimensione universale per Giudei e Gentili, accolta mediante la fede. In più il K. propone doppiamente di vedere, a monte, una preparazione di queste prospettive nell'episodio della purificazione del Tempio di Gerusalemme da parte di Gesù (compreso il loghion sulla sua distruzione e riedificazione), e, a valle, uno sviluppo teologico del tema nella Lettera agli Ebrei.

L'Autore ha sicuramente fatto un lavoro degno di attenzione. L'idea della morte di Gesù come luogo escatologico dell'espiazione e della epifania di Dio ha degli interessanti risvolti, sia sulla comprensione della storia in rapporto alla croce di Cristo, sia per quanto riguarda la concezione della chiesa come nuova comunità di redenti.

Tuttavia, non è possibile tacere alcuni rilievi critici che si impongono con forza. Il primo di questi concerne l'utilizzo di Lev 16. Per una adeguata lettura di questa decisiva pagina biblica è assolutamente necessario prendere atto della sua complessità redazionale, frutto della convergenza di tradizioni di epoche diverse (cf. i commenti di K. Elliger, 1966, e di J. Milgrom, 1991). Anche il K. lo sa, ma la sua lettura è a senso unico e orientata dalla sua interpretazione (vedi ciò che scrive D.P. Wright, «Day of Atonement», *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* 2, 74: "The evidence is susceptible to various interpretations depending upon one's methodological or theoretical framework and emphasis"). In effetti, altri Autori (cf. B. Janowski, 1982) intendono già il rito del capro espiatorio come sacrificio di generale perdono dei peccati del popolo (vedi soprattutto Lev 16,1-10), mentre solo in un secondo tempo esso sarebbe stato riferito chiaramente alla purificazione del Tempio e dell'altare. (Più in generale, cf. ora le importanti precisazioni di A. Schenker, «Interprétations récentes et dimensions spécifiques du sacrifice *ḥaṭṭāt*», *Bib.* 75 [1994] 59-70.) D'altronde, che il Yôm Kippûr comprendesse un perdono generale e che la purificazione del Tempio non fosse essenziale, risulta sia dal testo qumranico 11QT 25,10-27,10, dove di purificazione del Tempio non si fa parola, sia anche dal fatto che la solennità continuò pure dopo la distruzione del Tempio, connotandosi come giorno del grande Diggiuno (cf. At 27,9).

Inoltre, il K. non conduce una vera e propria indagine sul giudaismo intertestamentario circa l'attesa di un nuovo Tempio escatologico e tanto meno su di una eventuale relazione del Yôm Kippûr con esso. Sta di fatto che il tema del sangue in rapporto al nuovo Tempio si trova solo in Ez 43,18-27; 45,18-25. In tutti gli altri testi (non soltanto in 11QT 29,8-10;

Giub 1,29; 4,24-26, presi in considerazione dall'Autore, ma anche in vari altri richiamati per esempio da E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* [London 1985] 77-90) non c'è mai alcuna menzione di questo tema. Una tale constatazione non può non far riflettere e originare almeno qualche dubbio sul presunto nesso tra sangue e nuovo Tempio nel testo paolino in questione.

Per quanto riguarda più da vicino il passo di Rom 3,25-26a, ulteriori perplessità mi vengono dalla citata comprensione del termine *πάρεσις* nel senso di «Hingehenlassen, ein vorläufiges Nicht-Berücksichtigen bzw. Nicht-zur-Rechenschaft-ziehen», invece che come «vollgültiger Erlass». In effetti, se si vanno ad analizzare più da vicino i quattro testi greci riportati a supporto di questa comprensione del vocabolo (cioè: Senofonte, *Eq.Mag.*, 7,10; Dionigi di Alicarnasso, *Ant.Rom.*, II, 35,4; Fl. Giuseppe, *Ant.*, 15,48; e Sir 23,2-3a) si vede che essi implicano tutti contestualmente l'idea della sospensione di un castigo, variamente espressa (cf. rispettivamente i concetti di ἀκόλαστον, ἀζήμιον, χαλεπὸν οὐδὲν διαθεῖναι, μάστιγας μὴ φοῖδεσθαι). Di conseguenza, in Rom 3,25 ne dovrebbe logicamente risultare che, essendo stati i «precedenti peccati» oggetto della tolleranza divina, ora finalmente in Cristo essi vengono puniti. Ma allora sarebbe inevitabile concludere che la giustizia di Dio rivelatasi nella morte di Cristo è nient'altro che una giustizia punitiva!

Infine, mi sembra improprio invocare la Lettera agli Ebrei come appoggio della suddetta tesi. Infatti in Ebr 9,22 il collegamento esplicito tra αἱματεχυσίας e ἄφεσις (= «senza effusione del sangue non c'è remissione [dei peccati]») dice almeno due cose: primo, che si tratta di un vero perdono dei peccati personali (come in 10,18; ecc.), e, secondo, che questo perdono è legato al sangue (intendendo perciò sullo sfondo il capro espiatorio e non il capro emissario).

In conclusione, il lavoro di K. va apprezzato come un originale apporto alla discussione del celebre testo paolino. La ricerca è stata condotta con molta acribia ed è ricca di molti dati utilissimi per lo studio. Le riserve sopra esposte vogliono soltanto significare che l'opera in oggetto è e sarà un inevitabile termine di confronto per quanti vogliano approfondire la teologia dell'Apostolo e del cristianesimo delle origini.

Pontificia Università Lateranense  
P.zza S. Giovanni in Laterano, 4  
I-00120 Roma

Romano PENNA

Chantal REYNIER, *Évangile et Mystère. Les enjeux théologiques de l'Épître aux Éphésiens* (Lectio Divina 149). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 312 p. 21,5 × 13,5. FF 165

Die Untersuchung geht auf eine Doktorarbeit zurück, die an der Theologischen Fakultät des Centre Sèvres, Paris, 1990 vorgelegt wurde. Im Mittelpunkt steht der Abschnitt Eph 3,1-13. Der erste Teil (11-81) befaßt sich mit der Frage der literarischen Einheit des Textes. In diesem Zusammenhang

werden auch andere dazu gehörende Probleme erörtert: die literarische Gattung, das Verhältnis des Abschnittes zum ersten Teil des Briefes (Eph 1–3), die literarische Struktur. Mit einer überzeugenden Beweisführung schafft die Verf. damit eine wichtige Basis für den weiteren Gang der Untersuchung: Eph 3,1–13 bildet eine literarische Einheit, bei der der Begriff "mysterion" eine Schlüsselrolle spielt (80–81). Der Klärung dieses Begriffes widmet sich der zweite Teil (85–168). In einem ersten Punkt wird die Funktion des Apostels als Diener des "mysterion" herausgestellt (89–104). Sodann bestimmt die Verf. den Inhalt des Mysteriums als ein "sein-mit" (*être avec*) (105–124). Die verba composita in Eph 3,6 und das durch die Bilder von "Bau" und "Leib" geprägte Sprachfeld begründen die inhaltliche Bestimmung. Das Mysterium als Gegenstand der Erkenntnis und der Offenbarung kommt im dritten Punkt zur Sprache (125–165). Im letzten Teil der Arbeit (*Les enjeux théologiques*) geht es um die Funktionen der zuvor semantisch untersuchten Hauptbegriffe: zuerst die Funktion der Metapher Leib Christi, dann die der räumlichen Kategorien und schließlich die des Mysteriums-begriffes (173–237). Beim letzten Thema kommt das Moment der Diachronie zur Geltung, indem der paulinische Sprachgebrauch als Grundlage für die spätere Sprachentwicklung genommen wird. Der Text von Eph wird abschließend, gerade im Zusammenhang mit dem "mysterion"-Begriff, als "Geburtsurkunde einer neuen theologischen Sprache" bewertet (239–263).

Die Arbeit ist deutlich gegliedert. Eine Zusammenfassung am Ende jedes Kapitels hilft, das Wesentliche nochmals in Erinnerung zu bringen. Die berücksichtigte Sekundärliteratur ist repräsentativ für den aktuellen Stand der Forschung. Der Aufsatz von H. Chadwick, "Die Absicht des Epheserbriefes", *ZNW* 51 (1960) 145–153, und die Monographie von P. Tachau, "Einst" und "Jetzt" im Neuen Testament (*FRLANT* 105; Göttingen 1972), wurden leider übersehen. Gewiß geht es bei der Sekundärliteratur nicht um Vollständigkeit — ohnehin nicht erreichbar —, aber die Arbeit von Tachau wäre besonders hilfreich gewesen.

Bei einem für das Verständnis von Eph so zentralen Thema wie es "mysterion" ist, versteht sich von selbst, daß auch andere wichtige Fragen einbezogen werden müssen, etwa die Christologie, die Ekklesiologie, die Eschatologie. Auch in der Behandlung dieser Themen beweist die Verf. ihre Fähigkeit, mit dem Text exegetisch umzugehen. Allgemein ist den Ergebnissen zuzustimmen. Dennoch möchte ich auf einige fragliche Aspekte hinweisen.

1) Die erste Frage ist methodischer Art. Die Verf. betont den Vorrang der Synchronie in der Untersuchung und stellt bewußt die Echtheits- und Verfasserfrage zurück (251, Anm. 18; 270, Anm. 7). Die methodische Entscheidung ist an sich legitim, wenn dabei Einseitigkeiten vermieden werden. Es geht nicht darum, in eine überholte "Quellenforschung" zu verfallen, bzw. die jetzige Gestalt des Textes durch die Frage seines Werdens aus den Augen zu verlieren. Aber ich halte für methodisch bedenklich, gerade bei Texten, die als Glied eines komplexen Überlieferungsprozesses entstanden sind, die diachronische Fragestellung — trotz des Abschnittes über die paulinische Begrifflichkeit — einer letztlich so untergeordneten Rolle zuzuordnen, wie es in dieser Arbeit der Fall ist. Ein Beispiel möge diese kriti-

sche Bemerkung verdeutlichen. Nach der Berücksichtigung des paulinischen Sprachgebrauchs arbeitet die Verf. die Aufnahme des Begriffes "mysterion" in Eph heraus. Dabei kommt die Bedeutung vor allem von Kol 1,25-29, aber auch von Röm 16,25-26 für die Sprache von Eph 3,2-10 entschieden zu kurz. Das Neue ist nicht die Sprache an sich, sondern die dezidierte ekklesiologische Anwendung und der theologische Horizont. Die sprachliche Grundlage für das Mysteriumverständnis war nämlich von der Tradition vorgegeben. Die ureigene Aussageintention des Textes würde besser zur Geltung kommen, hätte man das Zusammenspiel von Synchronie und Diachronie in der Analyse und Deutung anders bestimmt.

2) Eine weitere Folge dieser methodischen Entscheidung wird bei der behaupteten Rolle der Schrift in der Argumentation von Eph sichtbar. Die Auskunft befriedigt freilich nicht, die theologische Konstruktion in Eph bleibe biblisch "dans la mesure où elle repose sur l'interprétation de l'histoire" (241-242). Denn das ist zu allgemein. Auf jeden Fall wäre hier zu unterscheiden zwischen dem heilsgeschichtlichen Entwurf und dem tatsächlichen Gewicht einer Schriftargumentation in der Darstellung von Eph. Die Anspielung auf Jes 57,19 in Eph 2,17 reicht m.E. nicht aus, um hier einen biblisch begründeten Gedankenductus plausibel zu machen. Daß die Verwendung von "mysterion" durch Dan 2 bestimmt sei, läßt sich nur behaupten, wenn man den Einfluß von Kol 1,25-29 nicht beachtet.

3) Eine Untersuchung darf und soll sich Grenzen setzen. Das Problem ist, wo die Grenzen gesetzt werden. Die Frage drängt sich auf: Auf welchem historischen Hintergrund entfaltet der Verf. von Eph seinen beeindruckenden ekklesiologischen Entwurf? Es fällt auf, mit welcher Konsequenz in der ganzen Arbeit diese Frage ausgeklammert wird. Die eigene Prägung, aber auch der Wert der theologischen Leistung dieses eigenartigen Textes des Urchristentums lassen sich nicht hinreichend erfassen, wenn man sie als eine Art von Theologie ohne Geschichte versteht und darstellt.

Ohne Zweifel trägt die Arbeit der Verf. die Züge eines bestimmten exegetischen Standortes. Ebenso deutlich erkennbar ist der Ort, von dem aus meine Fragen gestellt wurden. Ohne den Wert der Untersuchung für das Verständnis von Eph herabzusetzen, waren die Fragen durch das Interesse geleitet, einen sinnvollen methodischen Konsens zu erzielen, der sich in einem besseren Dienst am Text niederschlagen müßte.



### Varia

*A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint.* Part I, A-I. Compiled by J. LUST, E. EYNIKEL, K. HAUSPIE with the collaboration of G. CHAMBERLAIN. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, 1992. LIV-218 p. 23 × 16

Readers of *Biblica* do not need to be persuaded about the necessity for a modern Septuagint lexicon. Although J.F. Schleusner's justly renowned *Thesaurus* still remains useful, it is somewhat dated (1820-21), and the past 170 years or so have witnessed considerable advances in the study of the Septuagint, its text, language and its relationship to the underlying Hebrew text of the Old Testament. Incidentally, Schleusner's work is not a lexicon in the usual sense of the term; Lust calls it "a lexicon of biblical Hebrew" (I). It is rather a series of text-critical notes on the Septuagint starting from something similar to the list of Hebrew/Aramaic equivalents appearing at the head of each entry word in Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint*: one must also remember that Schleusner's lexicon contains all words in those Septuagint books for which there has never been, or has not been preserved, a Semitic original. There are two other considerations which make the compilation of a modern Septuagint lexicon highly desirable: new insights into the nature of the Greek of the Septuagint made possible through the discovery of a large quantity of Greek texts, papyri and inscriptions, all unknown to Schleusner and dating from the Hellenistic and Roman periods on the one hand, and the revived interest in the Septuagint on the other, largely stimulated again through the discovery of new materials, namely Biblical texts from the Judaean Desert, as well as interest in the history of ancient interpretation of the Bible where the Greek translation naturally occupies a prominent place. That the team of scholars headed by Prof. J. Lust of Leuven were aware of these circumstances is apparent from the Introduction to the lexicon under review.

The text on which the lexicon is based is that of Rahlfs' *Handausgabe* (1935). "Words occurring in the critical apparatus [of Rahlfs' edition] as well as the variants attested in the critical editions from Cambridge and Göttingen, are not systematically incorporated" (III). Where Rahlfs has printed more than one text-form, as in *Judges*, our lexicon treats both text-forms fully and on an equal footing. Moreover the materials of the so-called "Three" have been left out, and that for good reasons (VI), although the extensive Hexaplaric additions in Job do form part of the corpus for the lexicon. This dependence on Rahlfs' edition means in effect that no account has been taken of the efforts and the fruits of the labour of scholars associated with the Septuaginta-Unternehmen at Göttingen. This significant policy is only explained rather vaguely as being "for practical reasons", one of which one suspects is the use of the database produced through the CATSS (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies). It is not, however, stated exactly what the nature of the association between these two projects is, though one can surmise that the statistics on the

distribution of each head word among five groups of the LXX books (see below) have been obtained from the CATSS database. One also would like to know, for instance, what Lust and his team think of a text-form embedded in a group of minuscules for sections of Samuel-Kings, a text-form by almost universal agreement earlier and superior to that of Codex Vaticanus, which forms the basis of Rahlfs' edition for these parts of the Septuagint.

The lexicon is meant for use by "students and specialists in the Old Testament and more specifically in the Septuagint, the New Testament, Intertestamental Literature, Patristics, Jewish Hellenism, and Greek linguistics" (VII). Whilst aware of "its limited scope and its practical features", the compilers believe that the lexicon should be of interest to more advanced scholars because of its attention to apparent discrepancies between the Hebrew and Greek texts on the one hand, and the bibliographical information found at the end of many entries on the other (VII).

The main body of the lexicon is preceded by a most useful Introduction penned by Lust, who briefly explains the background of the lexicon, its contents and layout, some general questions on the nature of Septuagint Greek and some methodological issues related to Septuagint lexicography. The Introduction is followed by a list of sigla, abbreviations, and a bibliography providing full information on the works cited in the lexicon by the author's name, year of publication, and page number(s).

The *first line of each entry* indicates what part of speech (noun, adjective, etc.) the word in question represents, and in the case of nouns the lexicon also gives genitive forms and grammatical gender and states which declension they belong to. For an adjective the forms for three genders in the singular are given. No such morphological information is provided for verbs; we are told that a separate volume listing all the verb forms and their lemmata will be published. Finally, the top line of each entry tells us the frequency with which the word occurs in five groups of LXX books of roughly equal size: (1) the Torah, (2) the Former Prophets including Chronicles, (3) the Latter Prophets, (4) the Writings minus Chronicles, and (5) the Deuterocanonical books "which do not occur in the Hebrew Bible" (III). The statistical information is rounded off with a total of the word's occurrences in the LXX. This division of the LXX is different from that followed by X. Jacques in his *Index des mots apparentés dans la Septante* (Rome 1972): the latter's division was (1) the Pentateuch, (2) the historical books, (3) the poetic and sapiential books, and (4) the prophetic books. Whilst Jacques does mix the Deuterocanonical books with the Protocanonical, from a lexicographical point of view, his division makes better sense, as it is based on the literary character or genre of LXX books. Moreover, it is not quite true to say, as Lust does, that the Deuterocanonical writings were mostly composed in Greek. Even for Lust and his team, for whom the lexicon is conceived essentially as one of translation Greek, the fifth column is of mixed character, covering books such as Ben Sira and 1 Esdras. However that may be, there is no doubt that the statistical information provided here is most welcome, as the data contained in the CATSS database is not

accessible to everybody nor easily retrievable. It is puzzling that there is some discrepancy between the statistics on sample entries appearing in Lust's article in *ZAW* 102 (1990) 261 and the figures given in the lexicon itself: e.g. for γῆ the former gives 982-467-800-526-317-3092, but the latter 983-572-805-450-344-3154. The top line also indicates whether the entry word occurs in the New Testament or not.

The *second line* lists the first five occurrences of the entry word, the first five apparently in the sequence of the LXX books as given on p. XVII, though this is not explicitly stated. The usefulness of the information thus provided is not immediately apparent.

With the *third line* begins the most important part of any entry. It is important to note that "for practical reasons" the compilers of our lexicon have decided to offer translation equivalents rather than definitions — "descriptions of meanings" to use their own words (VI); they do not elaborate on these "practical reasons". As a rule they have adhered to this policy, though occasionally we notice a mixture of the two approaches: e.g. βρῶμα, "that which is eaten", "food", "meat" (Gen 6,21). There are also found occasional semantic notes as under βωμός, "(pagan, illegitimate) altar" (as opposed to the Israelite θυσιαστήριον, often = כִּמְזֶה) (Hos 10,8), although in this particular case the Greek word in question is not opposed to θυσιαστήριον, which is also in this passage a reference to sites of idolatrous practices. We are told, in a generally lucid and explicit explanation of the layout of entries that "When the word in question has more than one meaning, several translations are offered [in *italics*], each of them with a reference to an example" (V). However, we are not told what the use of a comma separating multiple translation equivalents preceding a single reference means. For in some cases, as in the above-mentioned Gen 6,21, not all the equivalents offered are equally suitable. Another case of similar ambiguity is ἀβουλία, for which we are given as translations "recklessness", "irresolution", "indecision", which certainly cannot be regarded as synonymous translation equivalents, nor are "sufficient", "enough", "many", "great" (Hab 2,3) (for ἰκανός) nor "kingdom", "domain", (Gen 10,10) under βασιλεία; cp. ἀγαλλίασις, "great joy", "exultation". Since except for words of extremely high frequency such as some prepositions, "each occurrence of a word has been checked in its immediate context with the help of the concordance of Hatch and Redpath and the text of Rahlfs [sic] edition" (VI), one might assume that one or other of the translation equivalents offered would suit any passage in the LXX where the word in question occurs. Whether this is really so, the future user of the lexicon will have to discover for himself. Without examining it thoroughly, the present reviewer is left helpless as to the verb ἀγαθύνω in Ru 3,10 ἡγάθυνας τὸ ἐλεός σου τὸ ἔσχατον ὑπὲρ τὸ πρῶτον. Likewise, any of the translation equivalents offered under βαρύνω seems to be suitable at Mal 3,13 Ἐβαρύνετε ἐπ' ἐμέ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν and Zech 11,8 βαρυνθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπ' αὐτούς.

Whilst the translation-equivalents method might be in theory well advised, in practice it could result in difficulties and ambiguities. One of the translation equivalents given for ἀγαθύνω in the active voice is "to do

well", for which Ps 35,4 is mentioned. However, 'to do well' in English means "to perform well, to one's best judgement or ability", whilst the Psalm passage is about morally good and acceptable conduct. "To do well" would suit 2 Kgs 10,30 ἡγάθυνας ποιῆσαι τὸ εὐθέες. One of the major pitfalls any lexicographer needs to be mindful of is that of confusing application with meaning. Thus under ἀγχιστής we find "redeemer" (Ru 4,14) next to "near relation" as its translation equivalent. But at Ru 4,14 it must have to do with a near relation of Ruth acting as her redeemer.

In addition to translation equivalents we are provided valuable information about syntactic matters such as in which voice a given verb is used, what case it requires, what preposition with what case it takes, and the like. As in a few other matters, however, we are not told whether such information provided is meant to be exhaustive or selective. Thus, for instance, under βάλλω we read "to throw", [τι], Judg (Cod. B) 8,25, and under ἐμβάλλω, "to cast" or "throw in(to)" (Gen 37,22). Is one to understand that βάλλω in this sense does not occur in the LXX with an accusative of person, whereas ἐμβάλλω in the sense specified can occur with either a person or a thing as its complement (in which case?)? As an idiomatic collocation of the verb βάλλω, the lexicon lists βάλλω κλήρον [sic!] ἐπὶ τινα, "to cast a lot over or upon", though the actual idiom has κλήρος always in the plural. On the other hand, βάλλω τι ἐν κλήροις, "to divide in lots", should have the noun in the singular. One would have thought that the combination with ῥίζαν on the one hand, and those with βέλεσι, ἐν λίθοις, and φυλακὴν are also idiomatic, and thus could be added to the list. Occasionally it is not clear why certain forms or combinations are cited: e.g. under θλίβω we find τῷ θλιβῆναι αὐτόν, "by the fact that he was hard pressed" (2 Ch 28,22) or under θρήνος, οἱ θρήνοι "lamentations", "wailings" (2 Ch 35,25). Furthermore, as this kind of information involves actually citing fragments of the text, we would like to know what policy has been adopted as to the difference or otherwise between the form appearing in the lexicon and the text-form actually occurring in the passage mentioned. Thus, again under βάλλω one reads βάλλω θάνατον εἰς κεφαλὰς τινῶν, "to bring death on the heads of" (Hab 3,13), which, due to the substitution of the generalizing τινῶν for ἀνόμων, which actually occurs in the passage mentioned, gives the impression that the somewhat striking use of the plural is integral to this particular collocation, when in reality it is merely a function of the number of victims involved in this particular case. Similarly, the fact that under a given verb no voice is specified does not have to mean that it occurs only in the active, middle or passive. Thus, under βάλλω, for which no voice information is given, one can only deduce that it is also used in the passive in the light of βεβλημένοι quoted there. On the other hand, under the entry word βαπτίζομαι [apparently middle] one comes across a citation such as ἡ ἀνομία με βαπτίζει [active], "I am imbued with transgression".

The lexicon under review devotes considerable attention to real or apparent discrepancies between the Greek text and the Massoretic Hebrew text. This is of course in the tradition of Schleusner, and attempts to account for the choice of Greek words which can be explained in terms of

metathesis of letters, variation between similar-looking (in one form or another of the Hebrew script) letters such as Waw and Yod, Daleth and Resh, haplography, dittography, vocalisation and the like, although most Hebrew (Aramaic) words and forms mentioned in the lexicon are not vocalised. Given the importance accorded to this section and the compilers' basic philosophy that the LXX Greek is translation Greek, one is struck by the fact that the surviving Hebrew Materials of *Ben Sira* appear not to have been taken into account. For example, one misses the reference under ἐπεγείρω to Sir 46,12 מְרַבֵּי read as מְרַבֵּי; under ἐξίστημι to Sir 43,18 מְרַבֵּי read as מְרַבֵּי hifil. Even regarding the majority of the LXX books with a Semitic original behind them, the treatment in this section of the lexicon appears to be selective. Thus, such obvious cases as 1 Ezra 8,74 τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἡμῶν for MT וְאֶחָדָם read as וְאֶחָדָם; Lam 1,4 ἀγόμενοι for MT וְאֶחָדָם read as וְאֶחָדָם are not mentioned. The absence of certain titles from the fairly extensive and valuable bibliography may be indicative of the suspected selectivity of their method: e.g. Dhorme's commentary on Job, Cornill's on Ezekiel, Wellhausen's on Samuel, Smend's on Ben Sira, Bewer's on 1 Esdras, to name a few. This same uncertainty regarding the extent of treatment applies to another important and interesting topic, that of Semitisms. More thorough and closer attention would no doubt reveal many more such cases: e.g. under ἀγαλλιάομαι one reads, among other things, "to rejoice in" [τινι] (Ps 80,2), where the LXX reads ἀγαλλιᾷσθε τῷ θεῷ... ἀλαλάζετε τῷ θεῷ Ἰακώβ, but the Greek word more likely means "to shout joyfully to" somebody (MT הִרְיֵי). Inevitably the lexicon's judgement may be occasionally open to question as in βλαστάνω, "to make to grow", "to propagate", "to produce" where we are told that the transitive use as in Gen 1,11 reflects the Hebrew hifil נִשְׁתַּבֵּחַ but the dictionary of Liddell-Scott-Jones lists such a use by Hippocrates. On the other hand, "leader", "chief" (of pers.) (1 Sam 14,38) under γωνία is not marked as a Semitism, though no Greek author uses the word with this meaning, but this interpretation is apparently based on LSJ (s.v., iv): this case is not mentioned by G. Caird in his well-known critical article on the LXX materials in LSJ.

When a verb has compound forms with prepositions prefixed to it, a list of such compounds is appended under the simplex form concerned. This list, however, is based on a purely formal principle. Therefore some items may have no real semantic relationship with the simplex form or with the words listed. For instance, διαβάλλω, "to accuse", ἀντιβάλλω, "to think over", ἀντιπαραβάλλω, "to compare with", διεκβάλλω, "to terminate at" etc. have hardly anything to do semantically with βάλλω, "to cast".

It is also an important task of Septuagint lexicography to investigate whether or not a given word is attested in Greek literature prior to the Septuagint. A symbol "neol." for neologism may be found at the end of a lemma. "neol.?" means that the word does not occur before Polybius. The compilers of our lexicon are naturally aware of some measure of uncertainty in this question (IV). Thus the user ought to exercise some caution here. The possibility of imperfect attestations, even in a vastly documented literature such as Greek literature, is quite considerable. Our

lexicon lists ἀγαθύνω as neologism, whilst the work cited there, R. Helbing's *Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta* etc. (1928), warns with regard to this very word: "Doch braucht man von lexikalischen Hebraismen nicht zu reden, da der Gebrauch später vereinzelt auch außerhalb der christlichen Literatur nachzuweisen ist".

Many entries conclude with most useful bibliographical information. On pp. XXI-LII one finds full details of the works mentioned in this section. This bibliographical list is quite extensive. The list should actually be longer, for there seem to be some accidental omissions: e.g. West and Witt under ἀγάπη. At times, however, one is left wondering whether the works cited have been fully digested or not. Thus, under ἀγάπη and ἀγαπάω, one finds an important study by J.P. Swinn (1990), but surprisingly no mention is made of a Belgian publication by R. Joly, which Swinn states had inspired his own study. Another example is βρόμος, which is glossed as "any loud voice", "groaning", and at Job 6,7 the word is said to be a correction for βρώμων, "stink". We are further referred to Wis 11,18 and Joel 2,20. But in all these places it obviously means "stink", "foul odour", and in Job 6,7, for instance, it is opposed to ὀσμὴ, "fragrance". One would have thought that Walters, to whose discussion reference is made in the bibliography section, had made a convincing case for a single vocable βρόμος. A semantic link between the two meanings is pretty obvious.

Lust explicitly indicates his indebtedness to LSJ (VI), though the compilers are by no means bound by it. For instance, the meaning "to seem good" for ἀγαθύνει at Ezra 7,18 ἀγαθυνθῇ...ποιῆσαι is a meaning unknown to LSJ, though we would rather suggest "to consider acceptable", "well advised".

Any reviewer of a reference work such as a lexicon would inevitably find himself disagreeing with the work under review at countless points of detail. We have attempted to draw the reader's attention to a number of significant general aspects regarding the philosophy of Septuagintal lexicography and its practice, and we have done this by drawing upon select examples. In the present reviewer's opinion we have here a highly useful tool, and as one who himself has dabbled in the same subject, the reviewer considers himself to be perhaps in a somewhat better position than others to appreciate the value of a work such as this and what its production entails. Finally, we wish Prof. Lust and his team the successful completion of their project in the near future.

Rijksuniversiteit Leiden  
Postbus 9515  
NL-2300 RA Leiden

Takamitsu MURAOKA

Stanley E. PORTER, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Biblical Languages: Greek 2). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1992. xvii-339 p. 24 × 16. £27.50 (\$46.75)

Prima di tutto, chi legge deve sapere che si tratta di una grammatica e non di una monografia circa le espressioni idiomatiche. Purtroppo, titoli di questo genere possono risultare ambigui o devianti. Anche nel nostro caso, in alcuni lettori il titolo ha suscitato attese distorte e quindi, poi, li ha portati a una delusione. Per conoscere la sua natura non è sufficiente considerare le pagine di «Contents» e neppure il «Preface»; bisogna leggere la «Introduction» dove l'A. inizia proprio precisando il retto significato del titolo. Forse sarebbe stato meglio dare molto prima tale precisazione, ad esempio già in un sotto-titolo. Ora, per valutare correttamente il contenuto del libro, è bene sottolineare alcuni propositi dell'A.

Egli dice di aver voluto preparare un «intermediate handbook» per studenti che, durante gli studi universitari, hanno già dedicato un primo anno a conoscere le nozioni-base della lingua greca (9.14). L'A. è consapevole che questo suo «grammar book» (14), per studenti del secondo anno, può essere usato da gente che possiede un livello di conoscenze molto vario: quindi esso può risultare loro o troppo difficile o troppo facile (14). Di fatto, altre esperienze didattiche fanno ritenere che, per studenti i quali provengono da un primo anno dedicato a studiare la lingua greca insieme ad altri corsi, questo libro si pone decisamente a un livello piuttosto sofisticato e ambizioso.

L'A. dice di aver voluto scrivere una grammatica che sia diversa da quelle tradizionali per vari aspetti (15-16): primo, perché essa si fonda sulle posizioni della linguistica moderna; secondo, perché, circa molti temi maggiori, essa usa e offre prospettive nuove; terzo, perché, in corrispondenza ad ogni argomento, ha voluto dare ampio spazio agli esempi.

Mi pare di dover condividere il primo motivo. Tale orientamento metodologico si avverte soprattutto per due aspetti: la visione sincronica, e poco storica, con cui l'A. esamina la lingua del NT (15) e la ripetuta distinzione tra forma e funzione. Circa il fondamento sulla linguistica moderna, secondo me l'A. fa bene a non dare qui riferimenti di dettaglio.

Il secondo motivo sembra un po' problematico, almeno in prospettiva didattica. Intendo parlarne più avanti.

Considero molto lodevole la terza caratteristica: infatti, con poche eccezioni, gli esempi indicati in questa grammatica risultano un mezzo sicuramente buono per illustrare in maniera concreta l'argomento che li precede.

Nella presente recensione critica, io non mi pongo sul piano di chi, come uno studioso della lingua greca, discute le posizioni dell'A. Invece, mi pongo soprattutto da tre punti di vista diversi. A) Quello della *comunicazione*: volendo verificare se il nostro A. è sempre chiaro e coerente nei suoi messaggi. B) Quello della *didattica*: volendo considerare se e in quale misura lo strumento qui prodotto è buono per studenti poco più che principianti. C) Quello della *traduzione* biblica: volendo segnalare dove e come questo libro offre indicazioni particolarmente utili a un traduttore del NT. Piuttosto direttamente, durante quelle tre tappe vi è l'occasione di mettere in risul-

to: sia il metodo assunto dall'A., sia i risultati che egli ha raggiunti mediante la sua ricerca, sia il valore globale della sua opera.

In genere la comunicazione è buona, lineare, scorrevole. Il che si può verificare circa vari aspetti, pur registrando qualche sintomo di non assoluta coerenza. Lo si vede anzitutto circa il modo con cui sono presentati i termini tecnici. La fatica di incontrare termini rari oppure difficili è attenuata, bene, in vari modi: a) mediante l'aggiunta di un «Glossary» che è facile da consultare; b) in certi casi, mediante l'immediata spiegazione di essi (cf. 205: «What it means to be in postpositive position is [...]»); c) mediante l'accostamento con un termine equivalente e facile (cf. 104.105.231).

Lo si vede per quanto riguarda gli indici. In appendice, dopo un «Glossary» e una «Bibliography», l'A. presenta un «Index of NT References» e un «Index of Subjects». Ma, purtroppo, egli non ha preparato un «Indice degli autori». Quindi il lettore non è messo in grado di collegare il nostro libro a qualche altro autore. Per esempio: un lettore non può capire subito se e come il nostro A. conosce, usa o valuta il «Greek-English Lexicon» di J. P. Louw e E. A. Nida (New York 1988) e i numerosi «Helps» prodotti dalle «United Bible Societies».

La bontà della comunicazione pare un po' problematica per quanto riguarda le altre grammatiche. Non si capisce bene se l'A. le critica poiché le giudica rigide e superate (28-29), oppure se egli — citandole molto spesso — considera che quegli strumenti sofisticati potranno essere usati almeno in futuro (14).

Problematico pare, inizialmente, anche il riferimento ai semitismi. Sin dall'inizio, l'A. dice che non ne parlerà o quasi, anche per il fatto che li considera linguisticamente poco decisivi (13). Tuttavia mi pare di poter riaffermare un'opinione diffusa anche a livello di riflessioni linguistiche: conoscere l'eventuale presenza e influsso di un fenomeno di quel genere può aiutare non poco a comprendere il significato effettivo di un testo. Più avanti, quando l'A. accenna a qualche semitismo, ora si esprime in maniera chiara e corretta (44.185) ora pare rapido e piuttosto oscuro (47.295). Comunque, quegli esempi fanno dubitare che la scelta iniziale dell'A. sia un po' forzata.

La qualità della comunicazione si manifesta soprattutto nell'uso degli esempi. L'A. fa bene a dare molti esempi del NT e, in quei casi, è opportuna la sua scelta di presentare anche una traduzione di tipo prevalentemente letterale (15). A p. 16 egli informa: «The standard I have used is to try to include two good examples of any given grammatical phenomenon. Sometimes they are more [...]». Ma, dopo la lettura del libro, viene da chiedersi: gli esempi presentati sono veramente sempre «buoni»? A p. 41 l'A. sta parlando del verbo al perfetto, del suo «omnitemporal use (gnomic)» che a volte è «used to refer to recurring processes of nature»; poi egli cita alcuni es.: dopo Lc 12,7 (= il fatto, naturale, che i capelli di ciascuno sono una quantità numerabile) cita Rom 7,2 (= la «legge» del vincolo tra marito e moglie). Un lettore può domandarsi: è opportuno indicare una «legge» come esempio di un «fenomeno naturale»? Quello di p. 105 può essere un «buon» esempio di uso dell'articolo in senso determinato se quasi tutte le traduzioni di Gv 4,27 adottano il significato indeterminato (non «la



donna» ma «*una* donna»)? Una verifica mostra che fanno così 25 traduzioni su 27. A p. 118 l'A. sta parlando di «[...] potential ambiguity in instances where the substantive does not have an article either [...]»; poi, dove sono gli esempi buoni? A p. 177 è presentata una frase di Flm 13, ma non si capisce se è un esempio di testo veramente discutibile. A p. 279 si cita 1 Cor 9,4-5: senza una illustrazione come quella che accompagna l'esempio precedente, come può tale testo essere considerato un esempio di domanda «expecting a negative answer»? A p. 285 si cita una frase di 1 Cor 22,2: in che senso è un esempio che va contro la regola evocata a p. 281?

L'A. parla più volte di «filler» e «slot». L'impiego di queste categorie, familiari a certi linguisti moderni, nel libro non risulta certo molto pesante; ma, sembra, non appare neppure molto illuminante. All'inizio, l'A. dichiara che esso gli è stato consigliato dall'esperienza (17). Altre esperienze didattiche, invece, suggeriscono che forse è sufficiente fare buon uso della opposizione tra «forma» e «funzione semantica».

Qualche problema riguarda la chiarezza espositiva. Infatti, a volte il pensiero dell'A. non risulta molto evidente. Ad esempio: a p. 43 che cosa si dice della posizione (b) circa «the future form»? A p. 67 o 68 si hanno esempi di «not only positive connotations»? Nel contesto di p. 70 che cosa significa l'espressione «an effect of contrast»? A p. 129 l'unico esempio di «descriptive specification» è chiaro e sufficiente? Il secondo punto di vista svolto in queste linee riguarda la didattica. Dopo aver letto il tutto, elenco alcune valutazioni che sembrano dover essere positive; poi, alcuni rilievi critici.

Circa il «basic sense», considero saggio un procedimento usato nel cap. 9 del nostro libro («Prepositions» 139-180): più volte l'A. dice che esiste un «basic sense» ma che questo non è sempre da considerare prevalente e presente nel pensiero dello scrittore. Tuttavia un punto pare più debole: l'ampiezza delle descrizioni offerte dall'A. tende a relativizzare tutto il tema fino alla conseguenza, didatticamente negativa, di presentare come sul medesimo piano sia aspetti centrali e frequenti, sia aspetti rari o secondari; forse l'A. avrebbe fatto meglio a offrire allo studente una più forte indicazione del significato centrale.

Anche il riferimento al «greco classico» pare degno di nota. L'A. dichiara che il suo libro non ne presuppone la conoscenza (13), ma poi nel testo vi fa riferimento abbastanza spesso (cf. 32.92.102.141.204.273.288. ecc.).

Non molto dissimile è discorso circa il latino. L'assenza di riferimenti a questa lingua è intenzionale (cf. 15). Essa risulta sicuramente buona per gli studenti che non conoscono nulla di latino; ma, didatticamente, tale proposito è come un'occasione perduta in relazione ai non pochi studenti che studiano greco dopo aver studiato almeno un poco di latino.

Diversamente positivo, e per certi aspetti diversamente discutibile, è il frequente riferimento alla lingua inglese per indicare analogie o differenze. Mentre questo è un sicuro vantaggio per studenti di lingua madre inglese, per altri risulta poco utile o addirittura un ostacolo. Di conseguenza: almeno per tale aspetto una eventuale edizione di questo libro in un'altra lingua richiede un certo adattamento.

Anche dal punto di vista didattico si può esaminare come l'A. si rapporta alle altre grammatiche. A volte le critiche, rivolte pure a grammatiche

note e autorevoli, sono tanto generalizzate (cf. 52-53) da lasciare lo studente più disorientato che convinto: alla fine, egli non sa bene se e come potrà/dovrà usarle in futuro. Bisogna però riconoscere che l'A., anche quando sembra distruggere posizioni «traditional» (225), tende ad assumere un atteggiamento modesto e prudente; infatti, le sue affermazioni sono accompagnate da sfumature (cf. 225: «more likely»; 227.228: «probably»). Ma, dal punto di vista didattico, la sua stessa modestia può essere un punto debole: poiché studenti del secondo anno sentono il bisogno di indicazioni o regole piuttosto decise.

Un altro atteggiamento dell'A. può essere detto di irenismo. Egli è notevolmente esplicito nell'affermare le sue convinzioni, ma in genere tende a non opporre drasticamente ad altre opinioni (16: «I have tried to be as accommodating to various perspectives as I can [...]»). Ciò è segno di maturità. Ma, pare, non sempre risulta efficace in prospettiva didattica. A studenti del secondo anno di greco io preferirei dare solidi punti di riferimento e soltanto in nota accennare ad altre posizioni, differenti.

Buona, perché aiuta studenti che conoscono o dovranno usare anche altre grammatiche, mi pare la prassi di porre accanto al titolo di un paragrafo, spesso tra parentesi, altri termini o altre formule usate per indicare quel dato argomento. A volte, invece, il lettore si trova di fronte a indicazioni piuttosto complesse. Ad esempio: quando l'A. parla delle frasi condizionali, il testo usa due sistemi di classificazione che sono nettamente diversi (cf. 255: «each works independently»); e lo studente non sa quale dei due egli deve memorizzare. Didatticamente sarebbe strano supporre che egli debba ricordarli entrambi.

L'A. tende ad usare poco le due categorie di «regola» ed «eccezioni»; tra i rari esempi cf. 112.259.281.284. Prevale nel libro la prospettiva di considerare la lingua greca del NT come una realtà elastica dove coesistono varie risorse... (cf. 230: è bene tener presenti tutte le possibilità semantiche; 267: «flexibility is required [...]»). Ma forse, per studenti del secondo anno di greco, dovrebbe essere più frequente l'indicazione almeno di una «regola pratica» (cf. 279), in modo che essi abbiano a disposizione qualche concreto punto di riferimento, e così possano assumere un buon atteggiamento interpretativo. In altri termini: da un punto di vista linguistico, mi pare che l'A. faccia bene a sdrammatizzare o demitizzare la nozione di «regola»; ma dal punto di vista didattico ho il sospetto che egli ne sottovaluti la funzione. Infatti senza essere un idolo, una «regola» è soprattutto una formula piuttosto facile e utile da ricordare e usare.

Giustamente si segnalano testi molto discussi dal punto di vista esegetico (cf. 227s.236.250-251.277) e, correttamente, si dice: il solo riferimento alla grammatica non basta a risolvere tutti i problemi, mentre in genere le più utili indicazioni vengono dal contesto (228).

Molto importante, buono ed efficace è il frequente rimando al contesto; più volte, si dice o si fa capire che in esso si trova il criterio ermeneutico decisivo. A mio parere, coerentemente con la posizione linguistica «elastica» assunta dall'A. e soprattutto per forti motivazioni didattiche, a studenti del secondo anno di greco l'A. potrebbe dire più esplicitamente che la valutazione del contesto è proprio *il* criterio generale.

Qualche volta l'A. cita traduzioni facilmente note ai suoi lettori (cf. 39.120.123.137). Tale procedimento, semplice e fruttuoso, è buono. Per questo, giudicherei opportuna una sua adozione anche molto più ampia e sistematica.

A volte l'A. si dilunga parecchio nella trattazione di un tema non centrale (cf. 274-275: "Indirect Questions and Commands"). Ma, per studenti quasi principianti, forse sarebbe meglio usare qui uno stile più sintetico.

Questa grammatica contiene un'ampia discussione degli «aspetti» o «qualità» delle voci verbali (cap. 1); forse essa è la migliore trattazione tra quelle da me lette nelle grammatiche esistenti; didatticamente molto utile è soprattutto la visualizzazione offerta già nelle prime pagine (23-25).

Infine, come ogni grammatica, anche questa offre indicazioni indispensabili per il traduttore. Infatti, se vuol tradurre bene, egli deve — prima — comprendere bene. Se colui che traduce conosce soltanto le nozioni basilari della lingua greca, qui trova un ottimo strumento che gli permette di approfondire e perfezionare le sue conoscenze. I seguenti paragrafi considerano alcuni punti che mi sembrano specialmente importanti.

In occasione di casi concreti, l'A. segnala più volte come il tradurre sia un'impresa non facile. Essendo un grammatico, egli potrebbe giungere alla conclusione, retoricamente diffusa tra non pochi filologi, che a volte un buon tradurre è del tutto irrealizzabile. Ma egli non lo dice, e questo è un suo merito. Tuttavia non segnala nessuno studio specifico su quel tema, e questo pare essere un suo limite.

La seconda parte del cap. 1 considera ampiamente il rapporto tra forma e funzione delle voci verbali (29-45: «Verbal Aspect and its Range of Functions»). Questa chiara elencazione dei diversi valori semantici assunti dalle forme verbali mi pare molto utile anche per un traduttore.

Parlando delle preposizioni, l'A. dice molto bene che il traduttore deve rendere il loro significato concreto nel contesto, e non il loro significato «basic» (142).

L'A. offre anche qualche buon suggerimento esplicito, sulla base della sua consapevolezza circa il fatto che le strutture semantiche delle varie lingue assumono forme nettamente distinte (cf. 68: «Translation of the Greek middle voice»).

Per motivi detti già sopra, in questo libro il riferimento critico a traduzioni concretamente esistenti potrebbe essere più ampio e più sistematico. Infatti, prima di essere uno strumento per far comprendere, ogni traduzione è una testimonianza di un modo di comprendere. Da un ampio rimando ad esse un traduttore potrebbe trarre sia uno stimolo sia una esortazione.

Alcune parole che leggiamo in 190-191 sono sintomatiche di preoccupazioni filologiche: qui l'A. suggerisce che la traduzione non sia esplicitante... Il che mi pare molto giusto. Ma, secondo me, forse sarebbe meglio introdurre una distinzione. a) Da una parte, la traduzione prodotta con intenti filologici non deve essere esplicitante. b) D'altra parte, una traduzione fatta soprattutto con l'intento di comunicare il significato effettivo di un testo a destinatari privi di interessi filologici a volte può e deve esplicitare quanto nel testo originario esiste soltanto in modo implicito; altrimenti qualche elemento semantico non è veramente comunicato... e allora si perde.

c/o Università P. Salesiana  
Piazza Ateneo salesiano, 1  
00139 Roma

Carlo BUZZETTI SDB

James H. CHARLESWORTH, with R.E. WHITAKER, *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project). Tübingen, J.B.C. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) — Louisville, Westminster/John Knox, 1991. xxxvi-529 p. 16 × 23,5. DM 248, —

Cette nouvelle concordance des textes de Qumran sera certainement la bienvenue. En effet, de nombreux textes ayant été publiés récemment, les instruments à la disposition des spécialistes demandaient une urgente mise à jour. On pensera surtout à A.M. Haberman, *Megillot Midbar Yehudah: The Scrolls from the Judean Desert*. Edited with Vocalization, Introduction, Notes, and Concordance (Tel Aviv 1959); K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen 1960), œuvre réalisée par le professeur de Heidelberg et son groupe d'étudiants avec la collaboration du séminaire du NT de L. Cerfaux à Louvain, et complétée par les « Nachträge zu 'Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten' », *RevQ* 4 (1963-1964); H.P. Richter, *A Preliminary Concordance to the Hebrew and Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Caves II-IX* (5 volumes; Göttingen 1988), avec U. Dahmen, « Nachträge zu Qumran-Konkordanz », *ZAH* 4 (1991) 213-235.

Cette nouvelle concordance est graphique. Elle ne classe donc pas les formes selon les racines. Ainsi, le mot *db̄r* est à chercher sous la lettre *dalet*; mais *hd̄br* se trouve sous la lettre *he*; la forme verbale *yd̄br*, sous la lettre *yod*; l'infinitif construit *ld̄br*, sous la lettre *lamed*; le participe *md̄br*, sous la lettre *mem*, etc. Une concordance analytique est annoncée, cependant, et celle-ci n'est en fait qu'un précurseur de l'œuvre définitive. Pour chaque mot, la concordance donne une partie du contexte immédiat. Les textes repris sont ceux qui ont été publiés avant 1990. Pour les autres, il faudra se référer aux ouvrages et revues spécialisées. Cf., entre autres, F. García Martínez, *Textos de Qumrán* (Madrid 1992), à présent traduit en anglais (Leiden 1994); B.Z. Wacholder — M.G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (Washington DC 1991); R.H. Eisenman — M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years* (Shaftesbury, Dorset 1992); C. Martone, « A Concordance of the Newly Published Qumran Texts », *Enoch* 15 (1993) 155-206.

La liste des textes est donnée p. XXI-XXVIII, avec le sigle utilisé dans ce volume et le sigle habituel. En général, ce sigle habituel et connu est plus long que celui utilisé ici. Parfois, le choix peut paraître problématique. Ainsi, 1Q34<sup>bis</sup> devient 1Q34<sup>b</sup>; le même indice, dans d'autres cas, peut cependant avoir un sens différent puisqu'il est aussi employé, par exemple, pour 1QS28a et 1QS28b qui deviennent respectivement 1QS<sup>a</sup> et 1QS<sup>b</sup>. Dans ce cas, l'indice ne signifie pas qu'il s'agit d'une autre copie du même document. Les textes hébreux et araméens ont été publiés ensemble. Là aussi, il faudra donc que les utilisateurs soient attentifs. Enfin, l'édition emploie une série de signes spéciaux pour indiquer toutes les particularités importantes du texte: le *sōp pasûq* signifie la fin de la ligne d'un manuscrit; les

textes restaurés par les éditeurs sont entre crochets; les corrigés interlinéaires d'un scribe sont indiqués par des parenthèses pointées; les lectures incertaines, par des petits cercles au dessus de la lettre; les parenthèses avec un blanc signifient qu'un texte a été effacé; lorsque le texte est encore lisible, il est imprimé entre parenthèses et pointé, comme le faisaient les scribes de Qumran; les lettres barrées indiquent une rature du scribe, etc. Voir la liste des abréviations p. XXXI et les explications p. XII-XVI.

A propos des textes, seuls les fragments qui contenaient au moins un mot ont été repris. En outre, et pour des raisons évidentes, les textes proprement bibliques ont été exclus. En tout, la concordance est basée sur 223 textes et 3500 fragments, ce qui donne 59.000 entrées. La concordance de Kuhn n'en comptait que 20.000. Certaines lettres se sont adjugé la part du lion, comme on pouvait le prévoir: les lettres *'alep* (1-49); *he* (113-159); *waw* (159-246); *lamed* (323-378); *yod* (262-297); *mem* (378-418).

Les utilisateurs de ce précieux volume devront sans doute surmonter quelques difficultés. Le texte a été composé sur ordinateur et imprimé en caractères très petits pour épargner de la place et, pour la même raison, les lemmes sont souvent très réduits. Chaque page comporte deux colonnes. Les yeux se fatiguent vite, avouons-le. Le choix d'une concordance graphique ne va non plus sans problèmes, par exemple pour qui veut retrouver toutes les formes d'un même verbe. De plus, il faudra tenir compte de variantes orthographiques propres à l'hébreu de Qumran pour pouvoir se servir à bon escient de cette nouvelle concordance. Ces choses sont bien connues des spécialistes, mais sans doute moins des autres utilisateurs virtuels de cet outil. Il leur sera nécessaire de consulter des ouvrages comme ceux de E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (IQIsa<sup>a</sup>)* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 6; Leiden 1974); E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harvard Semitic Studies 29; Atlanta 1986). Citons, à titre d'exemple, l'existence des digraphes propres à Qumran, comme le mot *r's* (*ro's*; TM) qui peut être orthographié *r'wš*, *rw's*, ou *rwš*. Certaines consonnes ont tendance à disparaître ou deviennent interchangeables. Par exemple, le mot *re'sit* devient fréquemment *ršyt*; *'ylym* (pluriel de *'ayil*, TM), devient parfois *'lym*; le *mem* final devient facilement un *nun*; le *reš* tend à disparaître et les gutturales s'affaiblissent; il peut y avoir confusion entre les sibillantes *samek*, *šin* et *šin*; l'usage des *matres lectionis* suit des règles particulières, etc.

En conclusion, cette concordance se révèle bien utile à plus d'un égard. Toutefois, il ne faudra sans doute pas trop vite reléguer aux oubliettes les ouvrages plus anciens cités plus haut. Le plus grand mérite de celui-ci est de fournir l'instrument le plus complet à ce jour. Quant aux quelques défauts mineurs que l'on peut relever, ils seront facilement corrigés dans l'édition analytique promise pour bientôt.

Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Roma

Jean Louis SKA

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

## IN MEMORIAM

**Roderick A. F. MacKenzie, SJ (1911-1994)**

Roderick Andrew Francis MacKenzie was born in Grassendale (Liverpool), England, on November 11th, 1911. The family emigrated to Canada in 1924. In the September of 1928 he entered the Jesuit Order at Guelph. He completed his studies for the priesthood both in Toronto and at the Collège Théologique de l'Immaculée-Conception in Montreal, where he was ordained in 1941. In 1942 he entered the program of Semitic Studies at the University of Toronto, completing his doctoral work with a dissertation on Israelitic law.

This early phase of his academic life coincided with the renewed interest in scriptural scholarship encouraged by Pius XII. By the 1960's he had become Canada's foremost Catholic Old Testament scholar, noted for his amazing clarity and conciseness in answering difficult problems. But at the same time he impressed people with his deep faith, academic humility, devotion to his priestly vocation, and consideration for his students – always searching, for example, to extract something valuable from their questions, even when they were not exceptionally brilliant.

In 1963, MacKenzie, long at the forefront of exegetical scholarship, and past president of the Catholic Biblical Association (1956-1957), was invited to Rome to become Rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute.

The Biblicum, with all sorts of controversies swarming around it, had been in something of a state of suspension, waiting for a new rector. Once MacKenzie's name had been accepted by the Vatican, there was some fear that the then Pope, John XXIII, would pass away before signing the nomination. His installation as rector, one of the last acts of the Pope, came only eight days after receiving notice of his new post and only two before the Pope's death. He left for Rome the day he heard of his appointment in a telephone call from the Jesuit authorities there. Shortly after, he flew back to Canada to complete his obligations there before returning to Rome four months later.

Once in Rome, he was forced to confront the trials of biblical scholars in a changing Church. However, his term there was providential for the Biblical Institute. Two biblical scholars there had been suspended from teaching, and considerable controversy was stirring over a proposed Doctrinal Constitution on Divine Revelation. MacKenzie suggested to Pope Paul VI that he lift the suspensions and he himself served as adviser to the Second Vatican Council until its close in 1965. Though not considered

an outstanding administrator, he soon gained a large circle of friends in ecclesiastical circles outside the Biblical Institute. He opened its doors to the outside world, making it a place where scholars of many different backgrounds were warmly received.

After his term as rector he remained in Rome for another six years, teaching the Old Testament, editing the journal *Biblica*, and being engaged in many other academic and literary pursuits. During this time, he published his commentary on Job for the *Jerome Biblical Commentary* (slightly revised for the *New Jerome Biblical Commentary* in 1990) and served as visiting professor at several universities and theological faculties, among them the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, California (1976-1979). Only in 1979 did he return to Regis College in Toronto, a year after celebrating his golden jubilee in the Society of Jesus, living there until his death on the thirtieth of April, 1994. In the private sphere he sustained himself spiritually in his trials in Rome, and throughout his entire life, with his love of, and confidence in, the word of God as revealed in Scripture and in the spiritual consolation of the Eucharist.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
00187 Rome

Frederick E. BRENK, SJ

### **Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense XLIV**

The forty-fourth Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense will be held from August the 22nd to August the 24th, 1995, at the Catholic University of Louvain (Belgium). The theme is: "The Book of Exodus". Proposals for short presentations should be sent to the chairman:

Prof. Marc Vervenne  
Chair of the *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense 1995*  
Faculteit Godgeleerdheid  
Sint-Michielsstraat 6  
B-3000 Leuven  
Belgium  
Tel.: +32 16 28 3828  
Fax: +32 16 28 3858  
E-mail: FAAAA10 @ BLEKUL11.

## Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 1993-1994. II semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 358, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	7	309	29	345
Fac. Orientalistica	—	—	13	13
Universi	7	309	42	358
Nationes	65		Alumni	358
Dioceses	175		Alumni	184
Inst. Religiosorum	45		Alumni	134
Inst. Religiosarum	8		Alumnae	9
Ex statu laicali	31		Alumnae	19
			Alumni	12

### Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica dignus declaratus est:

MAZZINGHI, Luca (5.05.94). *Notte di paura e di luce*. Esegesi di Sap 17,1 – 18,4 (Magna cum laude). Moderator: M. GILBERT.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

COLERIDGE, Mark, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative*. Narrative as Christology in Luke 1–2. Sheffield 1993.

GRASSO, Santi, *Gesù e i suoi fratelli*. Contributi allo studio della cristologia e dell'antropologia nel Vangelo di Matteo. Bologna 1993.

NAGEL, Elizabeth Marie, *Genesis 15*. The Doubling of a Form. Rome 1993 (extractum).

POPOVIĆ, Anto, OFM, *The Election-Rejection of Saul*. 1 Sam 9,1-11, 15; 13,7b-15a; 15,1-35; 28,3-25. Roma 1994 (extractum).

THERATH, Antony, *Jerusalem in the Gospel of John*. An Exegetico-Theological Study. Rome 1994 (extractum).



## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

La liste ci-dessous comprend tous les livres adressés à *Biblica* qui sont en rapport avec les études bibliques, y compris ceux qui ne pourront faire l'objet d'un compte rendu. En signalant un ouvrage, la Revue ne se prononce pas à son sujet.

Les livres envoyés à la Revue ne seront pas retournés à l'expéditeur, même si aucun compte rendu n'en est publié (à moins qu'ils n'aient été envoyés sur demande de la Direction).

Les livres et les articles ou extraits de revues qui nous sont adressés seront communiqués au directeur de l'*Elenchus of Biblica*.

Prière d'adresser les envois à la «Direction de *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, 00187 Rome, Italie».

**Aejmelaeus**, Anneli, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*. Collected Essays. Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1993. 119 p. 15 × 23

**Aparicio Rodríguez**, Ángel, *Tú eres mi Bien*. Análisis exegetico y teológico del Salmo 16. Aplicación a la vida religiosa (Monografias 1). Madrid, Publicaciones Claretianas, 1993. 550 p. 16 × 23

*Ascension du prophète Isaïe* (Apocryphes). Traduction, introduction et notes par Enrico Norelli. Turnhout, Brepols, 1993. 186 p. 12 × 19. FB 353.77

**Auld**, A. Graeme (ed.), *Understanding Poets and Prophets*. Essays in Honour of George Wishart Anderson (JSOT Supplement Series 152). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 445 p. 14 × 22. £45.00 – \$70.00

**Barnhart**, Bruno, *The Good Wine*. Reading John from the Center. New York – Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1993. vi-537 p. 15 × 23. \$19.95

*Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990*. Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology. Jerusalem, June 1990. Pre-Congress Symposium: Population, Production and Power. Supplement. s. l., Israel Exploration Society, 1993. 149 p. 17 × 24

*Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990*. Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology. Jerusalem, June-July 1990. s. l., Israel Exploration Society; The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1993. xvii-770 p. 18 × 24,5

**Bouttier**, Michel, *Visages de l'Évangile* (Essais Bibliques 24). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1993. 231 p. 15 × 21

**Breneman**, Mervin, *Esra Nehemiah Esther* (The New American Commentary 10). Nashville, Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1993. 383 p. 16 × 23

**Calvin**, John, *Daniel I (Chapters 1-6)* (Calvin's Old Testament Commentaries 20). Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company – Carlisle, The Paternoster Press, 1993. xiii-300 p. 15 × 23

**Carrón, Julián**, *Jesús, El Mesías Manifestado*. Tradición literaria y trasfondo judío de Hch 3,19-26 (Studia Semitica Novi Testamenti 2). Madrid, Editorial Ciudad Nueva. Fundación San Justino, 1993. 316p. 16 × 24

**Charlesworth, James H. – Evans, Craig A.** (eds.), *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSS 14; Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 2). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 319p. 14 × 22. £35.00 — \$60.00

**Craig, Kenneth M.**, *A Poetics of Jonah*. Art in the Service of Ideology. Colombia, University of South Carolina Press, 1993. XIII-221 p. 16 × 23,5. \$34.95

**Cunchillos, Jesús-Luis – Vita, Juan-Pablo** (eds.), *Banco de Datos Filológicos Semíticos Noroccidentales*. Primera Parte: Datos Ugaríticos – I. Textos Ugaríticos. Madrid, CSIC Instituto de Filología – Departamento de Filología Bíblica y de Oriente Antiguo, 1993. XXI-906 p. 18 × 25

**Cuvillier, Elian**, *Le Concept de ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΗ dans le Second Évangile*. Son arrière-plan littéraire, sa signification dans le cadre de la rédaction marcienne, son utilisation dans la tradition de Jésus (EB 19). Paris, Éditions J. Gabalda et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1993. 282p. 16 × 24 FF 325

**D'Alario, Vittoria**, *Il libro del Qohelet*. Struttura letteraria e retorica (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 27). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1993. 260 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 36.000

**Davidson, Ole**, *The Narrative Jesus*. A Semiotic Reading of Mark's Gospel. Aarhus, Aarhus University Press, 1993. x-404p. 17,5 × 24,5. DKr 198,—

**Davies, Graham I.**, *Hosea* (Old Testament Guides). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 122p. 13,5 × 21,5. £5.95 – \$9.95

**Dearman, J. Andrew**, *Religion & Culture in Ancient Israel*. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1992. xvi-281 p. 15,5 × 21,5

**De Boer, Martinus C.** (ed.), *From Jesus to John*. Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge (JSNTSS 84). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 363 p. 14 × 22. £45.00 – \$75.00

**de Pury, Albert**, *Homme et animal Dieu les créa*. L'Ancien Testament et les animaux (Essais bibliques 25). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1993. 82p. 15 × 21. SFr 20,—

**Donner, Herbert**, *The Mosaic Map of Madaba*. An Introductory Guide (Palaestina Antiqua 7). Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1992. 102p. 15,5 × 23

**Dunn, James D.G.**, *Christian Liberty*. A New Testament Perspective (The Didsbury Lectures). Carlisle, The Paternoster Press, 1993. xi-115p. 13,5 × 21,5

**Dunn, James D.G.**, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Black's New Testament Commentaries 9). Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1993. xxiv-375p. 14,5 × 21,5

**Dunn, James D.G.**, *The theology of Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (New Testament theology). Cambridge, University Press, 1993. xviii-161p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: £27.95 (\$44.95); paper: £9.95 (\$15.95)

**Dunn, James D.G. – Suggate, Alan M.,** *The Justice of God. A Fresh Look at the Old Doctrine of Justification by Faith.* Carlisle, The Paternoster Press, 1993. 87 p. 13,5 × 21,5

**Ebersohn, Michael,** *Das Nächstenliebegebot in der synoptischen Tradition* (Marburger Theologische Studien 37). Marburg, N.G. Elwert Verlag, 1993. 280 p. 17 × 24. DM 58,—

**Epp, Eldon J. – Fee, Gordon D.,** *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism.* (Studies and Documents 45). Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992. iv-414 p. 17 × 25,5. \$39.99

**Évagre le Pontique,** *Scholies à l'Ecclésiaste.* Édition princeps du texte grec, introduction, notes et index par Paul Géhin (SC 397). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 200 p. 12,5 × 19,5. FF 116

*L'évangile de Barthélemy.* D'après deux écrits apocryphes (Apocryphes). Texte présenté et traduit par Jean-Daniel Kaestli et Pierre Cherix. Turnhout, Brepols, 1993. 381 p. 12 × 19. FB 400

**Exum, J. Cheryl – Clines, David J.A. (eds.),** *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible* (JSOT Supplement Series 143). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 276 p. 14 × 22. £32.50 – \$55.00

**Faust, Eberhard,** *Pax Christi et Pax Caesaris.* Religionsgeschichtliche, traditions- und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zum Epheserbrief (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 24). Freiburg, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1993. 522 p. 16,5 × 23,5. SFr 96,—

**Feldman, Louis H.,** *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World.* Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1992. xii-679 p. 16 × 24

**Feldtkeller, Andreas,** *Identitätssuche des syrischen Urchristentums.* Mission, Inkulturation und Pluralität im ältesten Heidenchristentum (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 25). Freiburg, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1993. 284 p. 16,5 × 23,5. SFr 69,—

**Fischer, Georg,** *Das Trostbüchlein.* Text, Komposition und Theologie von Jer 30–31 (SBB 26). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1993. x-298 p. 15,5 × 23

**Fitzmyer, Joseph A.,** *According to Paul.* Studies in the Theology of the Apostle. New York–Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1992. xi-177 p. 14 × 21,5. \$12.95

**Fitzmyer, Joseph A.,** *Romans.* A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 33). New York, Doubleday, 1993. xxxiv-793 p. 16 × 24. \$40.00

**Focant, Camille (ed.),** *The Synoptic Gospels.* Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism (BETL 110). Leuven, Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993. xxxix-670 p. 16 × 24,5. BF 3000

**Furnish, Victor Paul,** *Jesus According to Paul* (Understanding Jesus Today). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993. vii-135 p. 12,5 × 18. Cloth: £19.95 (\$29.95); paper: £6.95 (\$9.95)

**Gaon, Solomon,** *The Influence of the Catholic Theologian Alfonso Tosado on the Pentateuch Commentary of Isaac Abravanel* (The Library of Sephardic History and Thought). Hoboken, KTAV Publishing House Inc., 1993. x-120 p. 16 × 23,5. \$19.95

**Garbini, Giovanni** (a cura di), *Cantico dei Cantici*. Testo, traduzione, note e commento a cura di Giovanni Garbini (Biblica Testi e studi 2). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1992. 358 p. 16,5 × 23,5

**García Martínez, Florentino – Trebolle Barrera, Julio**, *Los hombres de Qumrán*. Literatura, estructura social y concepciones religiosas (Colección Estructuras y Procesos). Madrid, Editorial Trotta, 1993. 278 p. 14,5 × 23

**Gianantoni, Luigi**, *La paternità apostolica di Paolo*. Il kerygma l'evangelizzatore la comunità (Studi biblici 19). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1993. 224 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 28.000

**Giblin, Charles Homer**, *Apocalisse* (Lettura pastorale della bibbia 26). Bologna, Centro Editoriale Dehoniano, 1993. 169 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 20.000

**Girardet, Giorgio**, *Bibbia perché*. Il linguaggio e le idee guida. Torino, Claudiana, 1993. 211 p. 14 × 20,5. Lit. 20.000

**Gooch, Peter David**, *Dangerous Food*. 1 Corinthians 8–10 in Its Context (Studies in Christianity and Judaism 5). Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993. xviii-178 p. 15 × 23. \$25.00

**Gottwald, Norman K.**, *The Hebrew Bible in its social world and in ours* (Semeia Studies). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. xxix-425 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$59.95 (\$39.95); paper: \$39.95 (\$24.95)

**Gunn, David M. – Nolan Fewell, Danna**, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford Bible Series). Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993. xvi-263 p. 13,5 × 20. £35.00

**Gunton, Colin E.** *Christ and Creation* (The Didsbury Lectures). Carlisle, The Paternoster Press – Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992. 127 p. 13,5 × 21,5

**Harrington, Hannah K.**, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis*. Biblical Foundations (SBLDS 143). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. xv-313 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$29.95 (\$19.95); paper: \$19.95 (\$14.95)

**Harrington, Wilfrid J., O.P.**, *Revelation* (Sacra Pagina Series 16). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1993. xix-271 p. 16 × 23,5. \$29.95

**Hass, Otto**, *Hermann Strathmann*. Christliches Denken und Handeln in bewegter Zeit. Bamberg, Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1993. iv-505 p. 15 × 21. DM 27,—

**Henaut, Barry W.**, *Oral Tradition and the Gospels*. The Problem of Mark 4 (JSNTSS 82). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 335 p. 14 × 22. £40.00 – \$70.00

**Hillyer, Norman**, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude* (New International Biblical Commentary 16). Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1992. xv-297 p. 14 × 21,5. \$9.95

*Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus*. Présentation et traduction du texte syriaque intégral de *La Doctrine d'Addai* par Alain **Desreumaux** (Apocryphes). Turnhout, Brepols, 1993. 184 p. 12 × 19

**Howard, David M.**, *An Introduction to the Old Testament Historical Books*. Chicago, Moody Press, 1993. 394 p. 16 × 23,5

**Huey, F. B.**, *Jeremiah, Lamentations* (The New American Commentary 16). Nashville, Broadman Press, 1993. 512 p. 16 × 23,5

**Janowski, Bernd – Koch, Klaus – Wilhelm, Gernot** (Hrsg.), *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*. Internationales Symposion Hamburg 17.-21. März 1993 (OBO 129). Freiburg, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993. xi-550 p. 16,5 × 23,5. DM 160,—

**Jarick, John** (ed.), *A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance of the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ecclesiastes* (SBLSCS 36). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. ix-291 p. 21,5 × 28. Cloth: \$45.95 (\$30.95); paper: \$30.95 (\$20.95)

**Johnson, Thomas Floyd**, *1, 2, and 3 John* (New International Biblical Commentary 17). Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1993. xv-208 p. 14 × 21,5

**Keel, Othmar**, *Dieu répond à Job*. Une interprétation de Job 38-41 à la lumière de l'iconographie du Proche-Orient ancien (LD Commentaires 2). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 185 p. 15 × 22,5. FF 90

**Klein, George L.** (ed.), *Reclaiming the Prophetic Mantle*. Preaching the Old Testament Faithfully. Nashville, Broadman Press, 1992. 315 p. 15 × 23

**Knoppers, Gary N.**, *Two Nations under God*. The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies, Volume I: The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam (Harvard Semitic Museum Monographs 52). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. xv-302 p. 14 × 21,5. \$39.95 (\$24.95)

**Korsak, Mary Phil**, *At the Start*. Genesis Made New. New York, Doubleday, 1993. xiii-239 p. 15 × 21,5. \$22.00

**Kysar, Robert**, *John, the maverick Gospel*. Revised edition. Louisville, Westminster – John Knox Press, 1993. x-157 p. 15 × 23. \$12.99

**Légasse, Simon**, *Naissance du Baptême* (LD 153). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 174 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 120

**Lenchak, Timothy A.**, *"Choose Life!"*. A Rhetorical-Critical Investigation of Deuteronomy 28,69–30,20 (AB 129). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993. xi-380 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 40.000

**Léon-Dufour, Xavier**, *Lecture de l'Évangile selon Jean*. III. Les adieux du Seigneur (chapitres 14–17). (Parole de Dieu 31). Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1993. 332 p. 14 × 20,5. FF 180

**Limburg, James**, *Jonah*. A Commentary (The Old Testament Library). Louisville, Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993. 123 p. 15,5 × 23. \$20.00

**Lincoln, Andrew T. – Wedderburn A.J.M.**, *The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters* (New Testament Theology). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993. xi-185 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: £27.95 (\$44.95); paper: £9.95 (\$15.95)

**Lindars, Barnabas**, *La Teologia della Lettera agli Ebrei* (Lecture bibliche 7). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1993. 184 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 20.000

**Lohfink, Norbert**, *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium* Mit einer Stellungnahme von Thomas Römer (OBO 111). Freiburg, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991. x-135 p. 16 × 23,5

**Margain Jean**, *Les Particules dans le Targum Samaritain de Genèse-Exode*. Jalons pour une histoire de l'araméen samaritain (École Pratique des Hautes Études II; Hautes Études orientales 29). Genève – Paris, Librairie Droz, 1993. 341 p. 15 × 22

**Marshall, Jay Wade**, *Israel and the Book of the Covenant*. An Anthropological Approach to Biblical Law (SBLDS 140). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. x-204 p. 14 × 22. Cloth: \$39.95 (\$26.95); paper: \$26.95 (\$17.95)

**Martin, Ernest D.**, *Colossians Philemon* (Believers Church Bible Commentary). Scottdale, Herald Press, 1993. 341 p. 14,5 × 22. \$17.95

**Masson, Michel**, *Elia l'appello del silenzio* (Lettura Pastorale della Bibbia 25). Bologna, Centro Editoriale Dehoniane, 1993. 118 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 15.000

**McCann, J. Clinton** (ed.), *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (JSOT Supplement Series 159). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 130 p. 14 × 22. £22.50 – \$35.00

**McConville, J. Gordon**, *Grace in the End*. A Study in Deuteronomistic Theology (Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology 1). Carlisle, The Paternoster Press, 1993. 176 p. 13,5 × 20

**McKay, Heather A.** – **Clines, David J. A.** (eds.), *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages*. Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on his Seventieth Birthday (JSOTSS 162). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 335 p. 14 × 22. £40.00 – \$75.00

**McKeating, Henry**, *Ezekiel* (Old Testament Guides). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 138 p. 14 × 21,5. £5.95 – \$9.95

**McKenzie, Stephen L.** – **Haynes, Stephen R.** (eds.), *To Each Its Own Meaning*. An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application. Louisville, Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993. 251 p. 15 × 23. \$12.99

**Meeks, Wayne A.**, *The Origins of Christian Morality*. The First Two Centuries. New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1993. x-274 p. 15,5 × 24. £22.50 – \$35.00

**Meiser, Martin**, *Paul Althaus als Neutestamentler*. Eine Untersuchung der Werke, Briefe, unveröffentlichten Manuskripten und Randbemerkungen (Calwer Theologische Monographien 15). Stuttgart, Calwer Verlag, 1993. xvii-455 p. 15 × 22

**Michalowski, Piotr**, *Letters from Early Mesopotamia* (SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series 3). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. xv-152 p. 15 × 23. Cloth: \$44.95 (\$29.95); paper: \$29.95 (\$19.95)

**Morgen, Michèle**, *Afin que le monde soit sauvé*. Jésus révèle sa mission de salut dans l'évangile de Jean (LD 154). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 401 p. 13,5 × 21,3. FF 175

**Morrice, William G.**, *The Durham New Testament Greek Course*. A Three Month Introduction. Carlisle, Paternoster Press, 1993. x-127 p. 14,5 × 23

**Mulzer, Martin**, *Jehu schlägt Joram*. Text-, literatur- und strukturkritische Untersuchung zu 2 Kön 8,25–10,36 (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 37). St. Ottilien, EOS Verlag, 1992. xi-414 p. 15 × 21. DM 48,— – ÖS 410,—

**Murphy, Roland E.**, O. Carm., *The Psalms Are Yours*. New York – Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1993. xii-148 p. 13,5 × 20,5. \$10.95

**Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome**, *La Teologia della Seconda Lettera ai Corinti* (Teologia del Nuovo Testamento 1 – Letture bibliche 1). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1993. 196 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 20.000

**New, David S.**, *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels, and the Two-Document Hypothesis* (SBLSCS 37). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. vii-140 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$23.95 (\$15.95); paper: \$15.95 (\$10.95)

**Niemand, Christoph**, *Die Fusswaschungserzählung des Johannesevangeliums*. Untersuchungen zu ihrer Entstehung und Überlieferung im Urchristentum (Studia Anselmiana 114). Roma, Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1993. xiv-460 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 65.000

**Nobile, Marco**, *Premesse anticotestamentarie e giudaiche di cristologia* (Spicilegium Pontificii Athenaei Antoniani 31). Roma, Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum, 1993. 140 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 30.000

**Norelli, Enrico** (a cura di), *La Bibbia nell'antichità cristiana*. I Da Gesù a Origene (La Bibbia nella storia 15). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1993. 423 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 52.000

**O'Callaghan, José**, *Papiros Literarios Griegos del Fondo Palau-Ribes (PLit. Palau-Ribes)* (Estudis de Papirologia i Filologia Biblica 3). Barcelona, Institut de Teologia Fonamental, 1993. 213 p. 16,5 × 23,5

**Ochs, Peter** (ed.), *The Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity*. Essays in Postcritical Scriptural Interpretation (Theological Enquiries). New York – Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1993. vii-378 p. 13,5 × 20. \$18.95

**O'Collins, Gerald, S.J.** – **Marconi, Gilberto** (eds.), *Luke and Acts*. New York–Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1993. iv-295 p. 15 × 23. \$10.95

**Peinado Muñoz, Miguel**, *Jaime Pérez de Valencia (1408-1490) y la Sagrada Escritura* (Biblioteca Teológica Granadina 26). Granada, Facultad de Teología, 1992. xx-280 p. 17 × 24

**Person, Raymond Franklin**, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomistic School* (JSOT Supplement Series 167). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 230 p. 14 × 22. £35.00 – \$50.00

**Polhill, John B.**, *Acts* (The New American Commentary 26). Nashville, Broadman Press, 1992. 574 p. 16 × 23,5

**Polzin, Robert**, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History. Part One: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature). Bloomington & Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1993. xv-232 p. 15 × 23. Cloth: \$27.95; paper: \$14.95

ISSN 0006-0887

---

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

---



---

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

---

Finito di stampare il 30 settembre 1994  
 Tipografia Poliglotta della Pontificia Università Gregoriana  
 Piazza della Pilotta, 4 – 00187 Roma